00035252

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 16 January, 2016

ORIGINES.

ORIGINES;

OR,

REMARKS ON THE ORIGIN

35252 of
6773

SEVERAL

EMPIRES, STATES, AND CITIES.

BY

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR W. DRUMMOND.

VOL. III.

TTd30

LONDON:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

SOLD BY BALDWIN AND CO.
AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1826.

Gold
935
Dri/Bri
35252

CONTENTS.

BOOK V,

PHŒNICIA,

contains 4 chapters:

CHAP. I. On the origin of the Phœnicians.

CHAP. II. The same subject continued.

CHAP. III. Of the geographical situation of Phœnice.

CHAP. IV. Of the fragment of Sanchoniatho.

BOOK VI,

ARABIA,

contains 5 chapters:

CHAP. I. Containing a few cursory remarks on the geographical situation of Arabia.

CHAP. II. Of the ancient history of Yemen.

CHAP. III. The same subject continued.

CHAP. IV. Of the Jorhamites, Chozaaites, and Korishites—of the kingdoms of Hira and Gassan—of the Hajarens and Saracens.

CHAP. V. The Arabian Pantheon.

TO THE BINDER.

Map of Phœnicia *to face p.* 1

Plan of the River Lycus —— 126

Map of Arabia antiqua —— 243

PHŒNECIA.
Miliaria Romana.
5 10 15 20 25 30 35
MEDITERRANEUM MARE
PHŒNICIA LIBANI
PHŒNICIA MARITIMA
CŒLE SYRIA
LIBANUS M.
ANTILIBANUS M.
TRACHONITIS
ITURÆA
DECAPOLIS
GALILÆA
SAMARIA
JUDÆA
Aradus
Antaradus
Mariame
Orthosias
Simyra
Demetrias
Arce
Tripolis
Laodicene
Tricris
Senan
Berytus
Theoprosopon Pr. et Port.
Heliopolis
Byblis
Aphaca
Gigarta
Chalcis
Lycus Fl.
Berytus
Heldua
Porphyreon
Abyla
Barada R.
Damascus
Sidon
Ornithon
Sarepta
Enhydra
Tyrus
Sinde
Acchoph
Albion Prom.
Ptolemais
Porphyreon vel Bostra
Carmelum Pr.
Calamon
Syeaminus
Magdiel
Dora
Nabata
Cæsarea
Legio
Jamia
Maximianopolis
Mageddo
Gabe
Ginea
Sebaste vel Samaria
Neapolis
Thenath
Bethmaela
Amathus
Galgulis
Thamna
Lydda
Jamnia
Azotus
Ascalon
Gaza
Rhinocolura
Raphanea
Cadytis
Ascalon
Gadara
Capitolias
Abila
Adraa vel Edrei
Thanita
Hippos
Scythopolis
Pella
Gerasa
Bathyra
Julias vel Chorazain
Jordanes Fl.
Lacus Genesareth
Lacus Samochonitis
Lacus Asphaltites
Jordanes Fl.
Torrens Fl.
Davir
Thaphua
Thebez
Succoth
Zartan
Ennon
Bethabara
Salim
Salcha
Gadda
Jazer
Gerasa
Molo
Abel Keramin sive Vinearum
Ramoth Galaad
Jabes Galaad
Gamala
Seleucia
Cæsarea ver Paneas
Phiala
Cæsarea Philippi
Sueta
Arce
Enes
Domus Saltus Libani
Vallis Libani
Cochaba
Bardine R.
Damascus
Chalcis
Abyla
Heliopolis
Laodicene
Arce
Ituræa
Trachonitis
Decapolis
Galilæa
Judæa
Samaria
Mare Mediterraneum
Longitude East from Ferro
Neele fe.

ORIGINES.

BOOK V.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE PHŒNICIANS.

CHAPTER I.

CANAAN, we are told by the sacred historian, begot Tsidon and Cheth—the Jebusite, the Emorite, the Girgasite, the Chivite, the Arkite, the Sinite, the Arvadite, the Tsemarite, and the Chamathite. These Canaanites originally possessed the whole country from the borders of Edom to Mount Chermon, and from the river Jordan to the Mediterranean sea. They appear, however, to have been expelled at a very early period from the inland country between the mountains of Chatserim and the city of Gaza; and from a great part, if not from the whole, of the coast between Gaza and Gath, by the Avim (עִוִּים), who were subdued by the

Philistines. (Deut. ii. Josh. xiii.) The Philistines were sprung from the Casluhim and the Caphtorim, (Gen. x.) and appear to have inhabited Colchis and Cappadocia before they passed into Palestine, though they were descended from Mitsraim, and were probably originally Egyptian colonists. The remaining possessions of the Canaanites were afterwards wrested from them by the Israelites, with the exception of a few fortresses among the mountains, and of a narrow tract of land along the coast, in which, however, were situate the great and wealthy cities of Tyre and Tsidon.

Such appears to be the general statement which may be made concerning the Canaanites. But it has been questioned, whether the Phœnicians were the same people with those descendants of Canaan who were the founders of Tyre and Tsidon; and whether these cities were still in the possession of the Canaanites at the epoch when the Israelites under Joshua first crossed the river Jordan.

I propose in the present chapter to lay before the reader some of the arguments which

have been, or may be, advanced, to prove that the Phœnicians were a distinct people from the Canaanites; and in the succeeding chapter to submit to him the answers, which have been, or may be, given to these arguments. Those who hold the first of these opinions may reason as follows.

1. The families, or tribes, descended from Canaan were eleven in number. The posterity of Cheth originally dwelt in Chebron, and in the region adjoining to that city. (Gen. xxiii.) Chebron was taken by Joshua, (Josh. x.) and was given to Caleb for an inheritance; (Josh. xiv.) but the Chethites were not entirely extirpated, and appear to have regained a considerable portion of their territory, since in the days of Solomon they had kings of their own. (1 Kings x.) Josephus (Antiq. L. 9. c. 4.) seems to have understood the Chethites, or Chethim, (חתים) to have been the same with the Cettim, or Kettim (כתים); and when speaking of their kings, he calls them kings of the isles. The city of Jerusalem was founded by the Jebusites, by whom it was called Jebus; nor was this

city won from the Jebusites, though the surrounding country appertained to the tribe of Judah until the time of David. (Josh. xv. 1 Chron. xi.) We know little of the history of the Amorites, or Emorites. The remnants of their tribe appear to have dwelt between the torrent of Hesbon and the Jobak, which streams flowing from the East fall into the Jordan between the lake Genesareth and the Dead Sea. The Girgasites abode in the country beyond the Jordan, near to the lake Genesareth, where they still possessed a city in the time of Christ. (Matthew viii. 28.) It would appear that the remnants of the Chivites had established themselves under Mount Chermon (in the valley now called El Kades by the Syrians). (Judg. iii. Josh. xi.) The Arkites took refuge among the heights of Lebanon. (Joseph. Antiq.) The Sinites fled to the desert of Sin, which lies between the Elanitic Bay and Mount Choreb. (Bochart. L. 4. c. 36.) The Arvadites retired to an island, which was named after them Arvad, or Arad, and which is not far from the mouth of

the river Eleutherus. (Bochart. ibid.) It would seem that the Tsemarites had likewise retreated northwards to the banks of the Eleutherus. The Chamathites settled in the country which is watered by the river Orontes, where, it is thought by some, they built the cities of Emesa and Epiphania, called Chems and Chama by the Syrians and Arabians. The original inhabitants of Tsidon and Tyre had been expelled from their inheritance before the time of Joshua.

Besides the tribes of Canaanites, there were the Anakim, the Rephaim, the Kenites, the Kenizites, the Perizites, and the Kadmonites, who are named as inhabitants of the territory conquered by the Israelites. But these were probably only branches of the Canaanite tribes, distinguished from the rest by the appellations which they received, on account of events or circumstances which are not recorded. Be this as it may, all the natives of the soil were either destroyed, or expatriated, or compelled to shut themselves up in fortresses, with the exception of the Tsidonians, whose country appears never to have been invaded, and whose cities were certainly

never besieged by the Israelites. Neither did Joshua enter within the walls of Tsidon; nor did the Asherites disturb the inhabitants of the coast from Tsidon to Accho, which was situate to the south of Tyre. (Judg. i.) Now as no reason can be imagined why the Tsidonians should have been left unmolested, if they were the descendants of Canaan, it may be certainly inferred, that the coast from Accho to the neighbourhood of Berytus, like that between Gaza and Gath, had been already wrested from the Canaanites before the time of Joshua, and that the ancient inhabitants of Tsidon either had been forced to quit that city, or had been reduced to the situation of slaves.

2. When the Asherites took possession of the territory allotted to them, it was natural for the Tsidonians, though they were not Canaanites but Phœnicians, to endeavour to repel the strangers, who had seized on the mountainous region which was in their immediate vicinity. They appear, however, to have soon come to an arrangement with the invaders; and if we find them counted among the oppressors from whom

God delivered his people, (Judg. x.) it was only immediately after the time when the land was first partitioned that they merited that reproach. It would even seem that they had made an alliance with Joshua, or at least had agreed to observe a strict neutrality during the war which he was waging with the Canaanites. The Israelites pursued the confederate kings, not only as far as Tsidon, but even to Misrephoth-maim, and to the valley of Mizpeh eastwards. Now if the city of Tsidon had belonged to the Canaanites, it is difficult to understand why it was spared on this occasion. (Josh. xi.) The whole territory of the Tsidonians, as far south as Accho, fell within the lot of Asher; and unless some treaty had been already made with them, there appears no reason why they should have been left in the undisturbed possession of the coast. That the Israelites had already entered into some treaty with the Tsidonians may be further surmised from the following facts. The battle between Joshua and the confederate kings took place near the waters of Merom. The kings, being defeated, fled in a north-west direc-

tion to Tsidon. Had the Tsidonians been their allies in the war, they would no doubt have found protection in the cities on the coast, among which Tyre was already remarked for its strength. (Josh. xix.) But instead of taking refuge within any of these cities, the kings changed their course, and fled eastwards to Mizpeh. The Tsidonians must, therefore, have shut their gates against them. Such conduct, however, on the part of the Tsidonians can only be accounted for, by supposing that they were not Canaanites, that they had already made their terms with Joshua, and that they had promised to observe a strict neutrality during the war. The Israelites continued for more than three centuries to be engaged in continual feuds with all their neighbours, the inhabitants of Tsidon and Tyre alone excepted. The friendship which existed between Hiram, king of Tyre, and David and Solomon, has been recorded in the sacred writings. According to the prophet Amos, the punishment was not turned away from the Tyrians, because they remembered not the brotherly covenant. (ch. i.)

But this ancient covenant appears to have been renewed in the time of Joshua, who could have entered into no covenant, much less a brotherly covenant, with a Canaanite tribe. It is in vain to argue from a passage in the book of Numbers (chap. xiii.) that because the Canaanites, in the times of Moses and Joshua, are said in the versions to have dwelt by the sea, they were therefore the inhabitants of Tyre and Tsidon. The Canaanites, according to the same authority, dwelt by the river Jordan. The word ים, *yam*, in Hebrew signifies a lake as well as a sea; and the sea, or more properly the lake by which the Canaanites dwelt, was no other than the lake called Semechonitis by Josephus, (Bell. Jud. L. 3. c. 10.) and the waters of Merom in Scripture. (Josh. xi.) This lake is formed by the waters of the Jordan, and is situate on the confines of the Upper Galilee. The sacred writer, therefore, by no means intended to say, that the Canaanites abode on the coast of the Mediterranean sea. This is indeed made evident from what is stated in the book of Judges (chap. iv.) concerning Jabin, king of Canaan. This prince,

it is said, reigned in Chatsor, which city was situate on the borders of the waters of Merom, denominated the lake Semechonitis by Josephus. We are likewise told, that Chatsor was the capital of the Canaanite kingdoms; and it is scarcely necessary to observe, that this could not have been the case if Tsidon and Tyre had belonged to the king of Canaan.

3. Thus the testimony of the sacred writers leads us to consider the inhabitants of Tyre and Tsidon in the time of Joshua as a distinct people from the Canaanites. Those cities had been, to all appearance, lost to the descendants of the first-born of Canaan before the Israelites quitted Egypt; and with the evidence of the sacred writers in favour of our opinion, we can adduce that of profane historians, in order more fully to elucidate and confirm it. The very first page of the most ancient Greek historian, whose writings have come down to our times, furnishes us with the proof of what we have maintained. According to the Persians, says Herodotus, *the Phœnicians came from the coasts of the Erythræan sea.* (L. 1. c. 1.) The Phœnicians themselves

gave the same account of their origin. *The Phœnicians, as they themselves report, anciently dwelt on the coast of the Erythræan sea, and passing over from thence, fixed their abode by the sea of Syria.* (Herodot. L. 7. c. 89.) They appear to have first halted by the lake Genesareth, called by some writers the Assyrian pool; but they were disturbed by an earthquake, and advanced to the coast of the Mediterranean. This is the account given by Justin. (L. 18. c. 3.) Strabo tells us that according to some the Phœnicians were so called because they came from the Erythræan sea, (L. 1.)—Phœnician and Erythræan equally signifying red. Dionysius Periegetes, the poet of geography, has the following verse in speaking of the Phœnicians—

τῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν γενεῆς οἱ Ἐρυθραῖοι γεγάασιν.

We might easily cite other authorities. As however they can add little weight to the important evidence of Herodotus, they may be passed over in silence. But there is a passage in Pliny which deserves notice. That author, speaking of the isle of Erythia, says, *Erythia dicta est, quo-*

nam Tyrii aborigines eorum orti ab Erythræo mari ferebantur. Upon this passage Vossius observes, *Ἐρύθεια est dicta ab Erythræis: Erythræi autem sunt Phœnices, qui hoc nomen adepti ab Erythræo sive rubro mari, unde Tyrum venerant. Nempe Erythræi, ab ἐρυθρὸς, ruber: Erythea, ab ἔρευθος, rubor.* A clearer etymology can scarcely be given. The Greeks either translated the Phœnician name of the island, which was probably אדום, *Edom*, into their own language; or called it Erythia, as belonging to a people who originally came from the coast of the Erythræan sea.

Solinus (c. 23.) thought that Gadir and Erythia were different names given to the same island by the Tyrians and Carthaginians. *Insula——quam Tyrii a Rubro profecti mari Erytheam, Pœni lingua sua Gadir, id est sepem, nominarunt.* In like manner Apollodorus (L. 2.) says, *that Erythea is an island, not far from the Ocean, now called Gadira.*

Strabo (L. 16.) informs us, that in the Persian Gulph, which formed a part of the Erythræan sea, there were two islands named Tyre and

Arad, (*Τύρος καὶ Ἄραδος*) which had temples similar to those of the Phœnicians. This statement is confirmed by other Greek writers; though from the negligence of the copyists, *Τύλος, Tylos*, has been frequently written for *Τύρος, Tyros*; and the error has found its way into the printed copies of Ptolemy and other authors. There can be little doubt then, that these two islands had once belonged to the Phœnicians. But why should they have bestowed on them the names of the two small islands which they possessed on the coast of Syria? Would it not rather seem that when they quitted the shores of the Erythræan sea, to establish themselves on the coast of the Mediterranean, they denominated the islands which they had acquired by conquest after those which they had formerly possessed by inheritance?

According to Julius Africanus, (Syncell. p. 61.) the 15th Egyptian dynasty was composed of six shepherd-kings, who came from Phœnice. We can only account for this irruption of the Phœnicians into Egypt by supposing some revolution to have happened in their own country

But it appears that these invaders of Egypt were not, properly speaking, Phœnicians, but Canaanites. The first king of the 15th dynasty is called Σαΐτης, *Saïtes*, by Africanus; and this name may have been corrupted from צד, *Tsaid*, and צדא, *Tsaida;* but there is less doubt that the name of the third king, Παχνᾶν, *Pachnan*, is nothing else than כנען, *Cnan*, (which, in following the Masoretic punctuation, we write *Canaan*,) preceded either by the Phœnician word פאה, *pah*, which signifies a chief or leader; or by the Egyptian article, sounded *pa*, *pe*, and *pi*, in different dialects. Pachnan is therefore either the Canaanite chief, or simply the Canaanite. Africanus, who copied, or who pretended to copy, Manetho, may in this instance at least, be credited. It follows that the Canaanites had invaded Egypt at a very remote period; and there seems no more probable way of accounting for this event, than by supposing that the original founders of Tsidon and Tyre had been driven from their possessions by the Phœnicians, who came from the coast of the Erythræan sea, as has been attested by the authors already cited.

The Phœnicians, probably as early as the time of Homer, were masters of the coast from Accho to the mouth of the river Eleutherus. Their fleets had already navigated distant seas, and their colonies were already settled in remote regions, long before the æra of Herodotus. They were, however, the only people of the Asiatic continent, with the exception of the Phrygians, with whom the Greeks in very early times had any communication; and the appellation of Phœnicians, which was given to them by the Greeks, must have been either a corruption of the sound of the name which they bore among themselves, or a translation of its meaning. Fuller derives *Phœnice*, *Phœnician*, &c. from פנק, *phanak*, a word little in use, and signifying *to educate delicately*. According to Scaliger, the original word was פנחס, *Phinchas;* which is ill-written *Phinees* in the Vulgate. Phinchas was a proper name among the Hebrews; and the Rabbin relate marvellous things of the son of Eleazar, who bore that name; but there is no authority whatever for connecting Phinchas with the Phœnicians. The derivation proposed by

Bochart has been better received, and yet it would be difficult to show how it is better founded than those already mentioned. He pretends, that the Phœnicians were called in their own language בני־ענק, *Beni-Anak*, sons of Anak; and that this name, often pronounced *Phene-Anak*, was sounded Φοίνικες, *Phoinikes*, by the Greeks. But the Anakim, or descendants of Anak, dwelt in the city of Arba, which was called Chebron (Numb. xiii. Josh. xiv.); and this city, which was situated in the land allotted to the tribe of Judah, was given to Caleb, who drove thence the three sons of Anak. Now these sons of Anak, who were named Sheshai, Achima, and Talmai, were afterwards slain, as we are told in the book of Judges, by the children of Judah. In what manner then can it be made to appear that the inhabitants of Tyre and Tsidon were descended from Anak, who dwelt in Chebron, a city of Judah, far distant from Phœnicia, and whose sons perished by the swords of the victorious Israelites in the immediate vicinity of their native habitation?

4. Let us endeavour then, without giving fur-

ther attention to these unsatisfactory etymologies, to point out the origin of the name of Φοίνικες, *Phoinikes*. We learn from the book of Genesis, that Esau was also called אדום, *Edom*, which name signifies *ruber*. Esau fixed his residence on Mount Seir, and the neighbouring country was called Edom by the Asiatics, and afterwards Idumæa by the Greeks. Esau had married a daughter of Ishmael, and this alliance no doubt facilitated the means by which the Edomites were enabled to extend their dominions in Arabia. The cities of אילת, Ailath, and of עציון גבר, Etsion Gabar, on the coast of the Red Sea, were among their first acquisitions. (Deut. ii.) Masters of these two sea-ports, the Edomites appear to have gradually obtained possession of almost the whole coast of Arabia. The tribe of Homerites, who according to Ptolemy inhabited the southern coast between the straits of Babelmandel, called by the ancients the straits of Diræ, and the promontory of Aden, may be considered as descendants of the Edomites, since their name is easily to be traced to حمر *hamara*, which, like *edom*, signifies *red*.

Ptolemy has however limited the possessions of the Homerites to too narrow a space, and there can be little doubt that their country extended as far east as the mountains of *Chamar*, or *Hamar*, that is, the red mountains. The Edomites appear to have had settlements in the province now called Oman; and there still exists in that province a city named ادهم *Adhem*, Red. The king, called Erythras by Arrian (L. 6. c. 19.), and by Pliny (L. 7. c. 56.), was probably one of the kings of the Edomites, who having sailed from a port in the province of Oman, was wrecked on the island of Ogyris, in endeavouring to pass into the Persian Gulph through the straits of Ormus. It is easy then to understand why the Greeks gave the epithet of Erythræan, or Red, to the sea which laves three sides of the Arabian peninsula, since the Edomites, or Red nation, occupied many sea-port towns on the coast, from the Elanitic bay to the straits of Ormus, and may have likewise possessed some of the small islands in the Persian Gulph. But Herodotus has told us that the Phœnicians came from the shores of the Erythræan sea. There consequently can be no

longer any doubt of the origin of their name, since *Phoinikes* in Greek signifies precisely the same thing as *Edomi* in Hebrew. The Phœnicians were descended from Esau, otherwise called Edom. We accordingly find the Edomites called Phœnicians by Greek writers. Procopius (Persic. L. 1.) mentions a village of Phœnicians (*κώμη Φοινίκων*) on the coast of the Red Sea. Philo Judæus, who was one of the most learned of the Jews, says, in speaking of a district not far from the Arabian Gulph, that it was inhabited by Phœnicians (*ἐννέμονται δὲ αὐτὴν Φοίνικες*). When the Edomites, Homerites, or Phœnicians, became too numerous to find the means of support in Arabia, they sent forth colonies, one of which passing over the mountains of Syria, and advancing to the coast of the Mediterranean, drove the Canaanites out of Tyre and Tsidon, and afterwards extended their territory towards the north as far as the banks of the Eleutherus. One of the cities on the banks of that river was named Himyra, and was no doubt founded by the Homerites, or Himyarites.

Pliny tells us that Erythras, who could have been no other than an Edomite king, (probably Homyar,) was the first who employed ships in navigating the Erythræan sea. Herodotus says, that the Phœnicians were descended from the Erythræans, (that is, from the Edomites,) who were the first who attempted to pass the sea in ships. Thus when the Erythræans, Edomites, or Phœnicians, for all these three names signify the same thing, took possession of Tsidon and Tyre, they became immediately distinguished by their skill in navigation, and by their success in commerce. While their neighbours were engaged in incessant hostilities with each other, the Phœnicians cultivated the arts in tranquillity; and the palm, the symbol of victory among other nations, appeared painted on their ships, and represented on their coins, as the image of plenty, and as the emblem of peace. In nothing did they resemble the slothful Syrians, or the rude Canaanites, or the yet more ferocious Philistines.

The passage in the prophet Amos, to which

allusion has already been made, can only be explained by admitting the Phœnicians and Edomites to have been originally the same people. *Hæc dicit Dominus: Super tribus sceleribus Tyri, et super quatuor non convertam eum: eo quod concluserint captivitatem perfectam in Idumæa, et non sint recordati fœderis fratrum. Et mittam ignem in murum Tyri, et devorabit ædes ejus. Hæc dicit Dominus: Super tribus sceleribus Edom, et super quatuor non convertam eum: eo quod persecutus sit in gladio fratrem suum, et violaverit misericordiam ejus, et tenuerit ultra furorem suum, et indignationem suam servaverit usque in finem. Mittam ignem in Theman, et devorabit ædes Bosræ.* The Tyrians had forgotten the compact, or covenant, of the brothers; but why should they have remembered it, unless they had been descended from Esau, as the Israelites were descended from Jacob? It appears that the Tyrians had aided the Arabians, Cushites, and Philistines, when they invaded Judea in the time of Jehoram; (2 Chron. xxi.) and when the Edomites, or Tsabeans, carried away many captives. (Joel iii.) Upon this

occasion therefore the Tyrians broke the brotherly covenant between the houses of Esau and Israel; and Edom pursued his brother with the sword; on which account Jehovah would not turn away his terrible voice, which announced that he would send a fire to devour the palaces of Tyre and of Bosra.

5. The authorities opposed to this mass of evidence are of no weight whatever. Sanchoniatho is cited to prove that the Phœnicians were originally called Canaanites. His words are as follows, as translated by Philo Byblius—Χνᾶ τοῦ πρώτου μετονομασθέντος Φοίνικος—which Bochart renders, *Chna, qui Phœnicis cognomine primus insignis fuerit.* But both Sanchoniatho and his translator ought to have known Phœnician better. כנע, *chna*, or *cna*, is a verb, which signifies *depressit, humiliavit;* and from this verb was deduced the name of כנען, *Cnan*, which the Masorites have taught us to pronounce *Canaan.* Now it is scarcely credible that either the Phœnician historian, or his Greek interpreter, should have committed so gross an error as to mistake the root for the derivative, and the verb for the

proper name which had been formed from it. Those writers, therefore, who have suspected the words in question to have been interpolated, may not be wrong in their conjecture. But Stephanus Byzantinus, it is contended, has said, Χνᾶ· οὕτως ἡ Φοινίκη ἐκαλεῖτο, and afterwards adds, τὸ ἐθνικὸν, ταύτης Χνάοι. Stephanus may have been misled by the very words, which we suspect of having been furtively introduced into the text of Philo's version of Sanchoniatho; and this supposition becomes still more probable when we consider that the name of Canaan is always written at full length in every other Greek book where it happens to be mentioned. The whole passage, indeed, from Sanchoniatho, which Eusebius has preserved, is thought by some to be a forgery of the Gnostics; and without carrying our doubts of its authenticity quite so far, we may admit parts of it to have been altered and amplified by those who had copied it from Philo before the time of Eusebius. If we believe others, Philo was himself the inventor and author of the work which he pretended to translate. Without adopting this opinion, we

may still hesitate before we receive the testimony of Sanchoniatho with unqualified reserve, or consider his authority as sufficient to determine an historical question. But with respect to the words cited above, our sentiment is decided. It is in vain that Bochart says, *nemo enim est qui non videat nomen Chna natum esse ex decurtato Chanaan.* A Greek, misled by his ear, might have made this mistake; but Sanchoniatho could never have written כנע, *cna*, for כנען, *cnan;* nor could this error have escaped the pen of his translator, who of course understood Phœnician.

Eusebius has quoted another author, who says, τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Καναὰν γεννῆσαι, τὸν πατέρα τῶν Φοινίκων—*hunc vero Canaan genuisse, Phœnicum patrem.* (Pr. Ev. L. 9.) These words are cited by Eusebius from Alexander Polyhistor, who professes to have copied them from Eupolemus; but the reader who may have patience enough to examine the whole passage as it is stated at length by the Bishop of Cæsarea, will probably wonder how he should have given so much credit to such writers as Eupolemus and

Polyhistor. They seem to have obtained their knowledge of the history of the Jews, not from the pages of the Hebrew Scriptures, but from the traditions of the ancient Rabbin, and the fables of the Chaldeans. Nor is it perhaps less strange that Bochart should have endeavoured to support his argument by such an authority. His words are sufficiently remarkable—*Habemus ea de re insignem Eupolemi locum in libro de Judæorum Assyria, quamvis alioqui multis fabulis intersperso.* We may also be surprised that the same learned man should lay any stress on a story told by St. Augustin. According to Stephanus, as we have already seen, the Phœnicians were known by the name of *Chnaoi.* Bochart, after quoting Stephanus, says, *hinc Africani rustici circa Carthaginem interrogati quinam essent, respondebant Chanani, teste Augustino.* Now the authority of Augustin appears very questionable upon this point, since he himself confesses that he could never learn the Hebrew language. The Bishop of Hippo might have enquired, whether the Carthaginians, who were descended from the Phœnicians, acknow-

ledged any connexion with the Canaanites. Finding no confirmation of what he probably wished to believe in the city, he went into the fields, and made his enquiries of the peasants. But Augustin, who did not understand the Punic language, (otherwise he would have found no difficulty in mastering the Hebrew,) might have been deceived by his interpreters, who most likely were no strangers to the answer which that celebrated person desired to receive.

Bochart seems to argue with more force, when he observes, that the names, *Phœnician* and *Canaanite*, are used promiscuously in the Septuagint. But what proofs, it may be well asked, have we, that the Greek version which we call the Septuagint, is really the same which was made in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus? The original Septuagint was kept in the library of Alexandria, and without believing all that Josephus has told us, we can scarcely doubt of its being held in high esteem. The jealous masters of the rival libraries of Alexandria and of Pergamus were not likely to allow copies to be taken of scarce and valuable books. May we

not suspect then, that the Septuagint, of which it is little probable that any copy was ever made, was destroyed by the flames, when the Alexandrian library was burnt in the time of Julius Cæsar? Had copies of it been taken and distributed, between the time of Philadelphus and Cleopatra, would these have escaped the notice of all the writers of Greece and Rome? If such copies had existed after the time of Cæsar, can it be supposed that they would not have been examined by Diodorus Siculus, by Strabo, by Tacitus, by every author who desired to become acquainted with the history of the Jews? Some have pretended indeed, that copies did exist, and that the law was read out of them in the synagogue of Antioch. One solitary authority can be found in the Talmud, by which it would appear that permission was given to the Jewish Hellenists to read the law in Greek. But this permission was given long after the Christian æra; and was besides understood to apply only to those who could not read Hebrew, and who wished to study the law in private. But the Jews never read any other than the Hebrew Pentateuch

in their synagogues, whether at Jerusalem, at Antioch, or at Rome. This practice has never varied from the time of Ezra to the present day.

Again, it may be asked, for what purpose did Josephus write his voluminous work on the Jewish antiquities, if the Greeks of his time could have consulted the Septuagint? Why, if it existed, did he never quote from it? Why did he never recommend it to the perusal of those Greeks who falsified the history of the Jews? How did he himself venture to vary from the Scriptures, so often as he has done, in order to meet the prejudices of the Greeks, if they could have known the exact truth from a version existing in their own language?

But Philo Judæus is said to have quoted from the Septuagint. Could not his version have been made from the same text as was afterwards consulted by the authors of the Pseudo-Septuagint? Are we really to believe that all the copies of the Hebrew text have always exactly agreed, and that Philo could not have made a translation from a few verses, or even a single

verse, or a single phrase, belonging to one which differed from the copy now in use among the Rabbin? Philo says much, as well as Josephus, of the Septuagint translated in the time of Ptolemy; but he never says that he had seen it. He tells us that both Jews and Pagans went often to the spot where the 72 interpreters had made their version. People prayed there, and feasted there. No one read a portion of the Septuagint, which might have formed a natural part of the ceremony, if that version had been really in existence in Philo's time. Is it not also extraordinary that Philo, who so lauds the Septuagint, should never appeal to its authority? He seems, as Josephus did after him, to have taken its character on report.

With respect to the writers of the New Testament, it is idle to suppose that they quoted from the Septuagint. When we have wandered with Michaelis through all the mazes of his tortuous reasoning, we may not come to the same conclusions. We may still doubt whether St. Matthew wrote in Greek; and if he did not, he of course consulted the Hebrew Scriptures when

he made his quotations from the Old Testament. If the Apostles had quoted once from the Septuagint, they would have done so always. Now Jerom, in his preface to the Pentateuch, has clearly proved, that the quotations in the New Testament do not always agree with the Greek version.

We may assert with confidence, that the Greek version was unknown until the third century. According to some, it was in the year 217 that the Septuagint was found. The Fathers of the Church, before that period, do not quote from this Pseudo-Septuagint. The authors of the Syriac version appear to have had no knowledge of it. The Syriac, we contend, was the most ancient of any of the versions, except the real Septuagint, which was probably burnt with the other books of the Alexandrian library. If in fact it could be supposed that the Apostles had consulted any translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, we should not hesitate to name the Syriac version. Thus the words of St. Paul (Ephes. iv. 18.), where he refers to the 68th Psalm, agree neither with the

Hebrew, nor with the Greek, but with the Syriac.

The truth seems to be, that several versions of the Hebrew Scriptures, written by schismatics and heretics, had already appeared during the second century. It therefore became necessary for orthodox Christians, who could not read the original, to have a faithful translation. The texts taken from the Old Testament, and translated into Greek in the New, were (with a few exceptions of passages probably overlooked) inserted in their proper places into the new Greek version. It was consequently believed by the vulgar that the Apostles had quoted from this version, which was falsely named the Septuagint; nor was it considered that those holy persons, *utriusque linguæ docti*, would naturally consult the Hebrew text, and translate it for themselves. In the course of ages, from the time of Ezra to that of Christ, discrepancies found their way into different copies of the Hebrew text; and in a few instances the citations, made in the New Testament from the Old, do not exactly correspond with the original

Hebrew as we find it in our present copies. But neither do they always agree with the Greek of the pretended Septuagint. Thus different copies of the Hebrew Scriptures existed in the time of Christ; and though no discrepancies on religious and doctrinal points were to be found in them, some few historical and chronological facts were not consistently stated. The citations made by the Apostles agree, it is true, more frequently with the Greek than with the Hebrew. We are not, however, authorised to conclude from this circumstance, that the Apostles were without a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures. The name of the second Canaan, for example, is omitted in our Hebrew copies of the eleventh chapter of Genesis; it is mentioned in the genealogy given by St. Luke; and we should be slow to admit that this Evangelist would have introduced a name into the genealogy of the descendants of Shem, on the authority of any Greek version, without having consulted the Hebrew original. When the Greek converts to Christianity became numerous, interpretations of the Hebrew text of the Old Testa-

ment were rendered necessary. Schismatics and Judaizing Christians took advantage of the variations existing in the Hebrew copies, as well as of the occasional obscurity of the Hebrew idiom, to publish unfaithful versions of the Scriptures. When the pretended Septuagint appeared, and when it was recognised by the Church as a faithful translation, some members of the orthodox party, misled by their zeal, maintained that it was the same version which had been made by the seventy-two interpreters in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. They consequently succeeded in depreciating the versions of Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion; but who is there now who can wish to give countenance to this pious fraud?

Thus the argument of Bochart is of no avail. The Phœnicians in the third century may have easily lost all traces of their origin; nor were the Christians of that æra likely to occupy themselves with the question whether the inhabitants of Tyre and Tsidon were descended from the Edomites or the Canaanites. They would learn from the Scriptures that Tsidon was the first-

born of Canaan; and they might conclude that his posterity had always remained in the city which bore his name.

6. It may however be admitted to Bochart, and to those who think with him, that the name of Canaanites was occasionally bestowed on the Phœnicians by the Hebrews, as it was a term of reproach which they frequently applied to their idolatrous neighbours; and accordingly in the first book of Machabees an Arabian woman is called a Canaanite. Besides, appellations are often retained when things are changed. The country had once belonged to the Canaanites; and when it was conquered by the Phœnicians, the new people might still have been designated by the old name. Among ourselves, for example, there are few, if any descendants, of the painted and naked barbarians, who so long struggled with the power of Rome; and yet what native of our soil but is ready to say, with the eloquent historian of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, that he glories in the name of Briton?

Many Canaanites may have remained in the

country after it was subdued by the strangers who came from the Erythræan sea, and may have been employed in menial offices by the conquerors. Thus might have been fulfilled the curse which was pronounced against their progenitor. The merchants for many isles, as the Phœnicians were called by Ezechiel, might figuratively be designated as the servants, who administered to the wants and to the luxuries of many nations; and in this sense the subjugated Canaanites might be truly considered as the servants of servants. But how could this saying be applied in its full force and literal signification to the Phœnicians themselves, whose fleets covered the ocean, whose commerce filled the earth, and whose cities seemed to exhibit the collected riches of the world? The wealthy merchants of Tyre and Tsidon, not only displayed the pomp, but exercised the power of kings. They levied armies of Persian, Lydian, and African mercenaries; and the mariners of every nation sailed under the protection of their flag. It is true that the princes of the sea were at last compelled to descend from their thrones,

and to put off their broidered robes of purple and gold (Ezech. xxvii.); but Phœnicia had already reigned for many centuries the queen of the ocean, had sent forth her colonies to many distant regions, and had extended the benefits of civilization to countries which were then considered as the most remote of the habitable globe. When at length the brightness of her glory was obscured, and when she fell from her high estate, as the Prophets of Israel had foretold, her fall was great, but it was accompanied by no peculiar marks of degradation. The Phœnicians were subdued by a powerful neighbour. They suffered the fate, which in those times generally befel a conquered people. Had they been doomed to become the servants of servants—had they been the descendants of Canaan—the prediction of Noach would not have been forgotten by Isaiah and by Ezechiel in their sublime and terrible denunciations against Tyre and Tsidon. But neither was slavery their portion, nor was their lot harder than that of other subjugated nations. The wise policy of the Greeks and Romans, who conquered in

order to govern, and not in order to destroy, was unknown, or at least was unpractised, by the barbarous despots of Asia, who in gratifying their passion for war, seem oftener to have been influenced by feelings of revenge, than by the less culpable suggestions of ambition, and who in reaping the fruits of victory, estimated plunder more than they valued dominion.

We may then safely conclude, that the Phœnicians were a distinct people from the Canaanites, since the contrary opinion is not only at variance with the testimony afforded by the sacred writers, but is plainly contradicted by that of all the Greek and Roman authors who have spoken of the origin of the Phœnician masters of Tyre and Tsidon.

CHAPTER II.

The same subject continued.

I SHALL now proceed to state the arguments, which have been, or may be, urged on the opposite side of the question.

1. It is admitted, and indeed it cannot be denied, that the Canaanites originally possessed the country which was afterwards called Phœnice by the Greeks. Tsidon, the first-born of Canaan, gave his name to the city, which continued to be considered for many ages as the principal mart of Phœnician commerce. But it is contended, that before the time of Joshua, the Canaanites were expelled from their possessions on the coast, from the bay of Accho to the promontory of Berytus, by the Erythræans, who, it is said, were the same people as the Edomites, and who were called Homerites by the Arabians. These invaders of the land of

Canaan, it is added, were the same to whom the Greeks gave the appellation of Phœnicians, which signifies the same thing as Erythræans, and which also bears the same meaning as Edomites and Homerites in the Hebrew and Arabian dialects.

The supporters of this opinion have prudently fixed the epoch of the expulsion of the Canaanites from Tsidon at a period anterior to the arrival of the Israelites in the Promised Land; because from the date of that event the stream of history runs clear, and we are certain that the Tsidonians, from whose oppression God delivered his people, when they first settled in Palestine (Judg. x.), were of the same race as those who were conquered by the Chaldeans under Nebuchadnezzar. By the Tsidonians we understand not only the inhabitants of Tsidon, but those of the whole country, of which that city was so long the metropolis. The report of the conquest of Tsidon by a king of Ascalon, mentioned by Justin (L. 18.), is unworthy of credit. We therefore repeat, that the Tsidonians of the time

of Nebuchadnezzar had the same origin with the Tsidonians of the time of Joshua.

Those writers, who have fancied the Canaanites to have been no longer in possession of Tsidon and Tyre at the Exode, would not have drawn such an erroneous conclusion from the evidence afforded by the book of Joshua, had they examined it with less prejudice, and with more attention. That book contains various passages, in which the Tsidonians are mentioned under the name of Canaanites. There were indeed ten other tribes of Canaanites; but it was peculiarly to the inhabitants of Tsidon that this appellation was given, as being descended from the first-born of Canaan. We shall begin with citing the first verse of the ninth chapter of the book of Joshua, as we find it in Munster's version, which is more literal than the translation in the Vulgate:—*Factumque est ut audirent hæc cuncti reges, qui trans Jordanem, in montanis et locis planis, atque in universo littore maris magni, e regione Libani, nempe Hitthæi, Æmoræi, Chnaanæi, Pherizæi, Hivæi, et Jebusæi.* Now there can be no question here with regard to the sea

which was meant. It is called in the original הים הגדול, *ha yam ha gadul, the Great sea,* by which the sacred writers invariably understood the Mediterranean sea. But neither the Chittites, nor the Amorites, nor the Perizites, nor the Chivites, nor the Jebusites, dwelt by the Great sea. The Philistines and the Tsidonians were at that time the only inhabitants of the coast from the river Sichor to the neighbourhood of Berytus. The Philistines were not Canaanites. Consequently the Canaanites mentioned in the text were the Tsidonians.

It is said that Jabin king of Canaan dwelt at Chatsor on the sea, or lake, called Semenochitis. This proves nothing against our argument. The possessions of the Canaanites were bounded on the east by this lake and by the Jordan, and on the west by the Mediterranean sea.

Jabin sent to various kings to assist him against the Israelites, and among others to those *in campestribus quoque, et in regionibus Dor juxta mare: Chananeum quoque ab Oriente et Occidente.* (Josh. xi.) According to Josephus, Dor, or Dora, was a city of Phœnice—τὰ δὲ Δῶρα πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Φοινίκης. The Canaanites on the west

could have been no others than the Tsidonians.

But when the confederate kings fled from the waters of Merom to Tsidon, it is pretended that they did not enter into that city, but turned to the east, and took refuge in the valley of Mizpeh; and from this circumstance it is argued, that the Tsidonians had shut their gates against the fugitives. This is a mere conjecture, and may be opposed by other conjectures at least equally plausible. Tsidon might not have been fortified, and the fugitives might not have entered into that city; or they might have gone into the city, and have been driven out of it by the victorious Israelites. The sacred writer gives us no information upon this point; and our business is with facts, and not with conjectures.

The following passage occurs in the first chapter of the book of Judges: *Aser quoque non delevit habitatores Accho, et Sidonis, Ahalab, et Achazib, et Helba, et Aphec, et Rohob: habitavitque in medio Chananæi habitatoris illius terræ, nec interfecit eum*—or, as the last words, כי לא הורישו, ought rather to be rendered, *quoniam non*

expulit eum. Now all the cities mentioned in this passage were contained within the limits of the country called Phœnice by the Greeks. The Asherites did not destroy the inhabitants of those cities, says the sacred historian; but dwelt in the midst of the Canaanites, who were the inhabitants of the land. What words can more plainly prove the identity of the Canaanites, the Tsidonians, and the Phœnicians, in the time of Joshua?

Now let us hear the words of Isaiah in the burden of Tyre—*Dominus mandavit adversus Canaan, ut contereret fortes ejus, et dixit: Non adjicies ultra ut glorieris, calumniam sustinens virgo filia Sidonis.* Here the commandment is given against Canaan; and Tyre, under the name of the virgin daughter of Tsidon, is apostrophised and menaced.

2. From these testimonies alone we might be fully authorised to conclude that the people called Canaanites by the Hebrews were the same whom the Greeks named Phœnicians. The fact is however placed beyond all doubt by several passages in the Septuagint. Thus in the

book of Exodus (xvi. 35.) where we read in the Hebrew text the words אל־קצה ארץ כנען, *to the border of the land of Canaan*, we find in the Greek εἰς μέρος τῆς Φοινίκης, *to a part of Phœnice;* and in the book of Joshua (chap. v.) the words מלכי הכנעני, *the kings of the Canaanites*, are rendered in the Greek, οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς Φοινίκης, *the kings of Phœnice.* In the same chapter for את ארץ כנען, *the land of Canaan*, in the original, we find τὴν χώραν τῶν Φοινίκων, *the country of the Phœnicians*, in the version.

But we are told, that this version is not the genuine Septuagint, or in other words, that it is not the version which was made in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, but was first published in the third century after the Christian æra. If this be true, the value of the evidence, no doubt, ceases to be the same. The Christians, who are supposed to have made this version, could not have been so well acquainted with the early history of the Phœnicians, as the 72 interpreters, who had flourished more than 450 years before, and who were among the most learned men of the Jewish nation. We cannot indeed imagine

the 72 interpreters to have been ignorant, whether the Phœnicians were Edomites, or Canaanites, while the Christians, to whom the Greek version is attributed, were little likely to be accurately informed upon this question, and were probably occupied in meditating subjects of far greater importance.

We are however by no means convinced by the arguments which have been adduced, that the Septuagint which we now possess is any other than that same Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures, which was made under the auspices of Philadelphus, and of which an account has been given by Aristæas, Philo, and Josephus. The objection, which is founded on the burning of the Alexandrian library, is altogether puerile. A part of that library escaped the flames; and if we indulge in conjectures, we may as well suppose the preservation as the destruction of the manuscript in question. It is however idle to contend, that no copies of the Septuagint had been taken before the library was burnt. The Jews established in cities, where the Greek language was commonly spo-

ken, were permitted to read the Septuagint, not long after, but long before the Christian æra. It is said, that this version was allowed to be read in private, but that the Jews have always and invariably read the Hebrew Scriptures in their Synagogues. The celebrated Joseph Scaliger is of a different opinion. He asserts the Greek version *per totam Asiam, Græciam, et Ægyptum lectam fuisse in Synagogis.* We are told in the 6th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, that *there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews;* and Dunæus in his notes on Chrysostom observes, that by the former were meant those who used the Greek version, and by the latter those who could read and understand the Hebrew text of the Scriptures. Other subjects of dispute may have existed between the Hebrews and the Hellenists; but this may easily be supposed to have been one principal cause of dissension. The Apostles, it is pretended, translated for themselves the texts which they cited from the Old Testament. This supposition, we maintain, is utterly improbable. Had the translations

been their own, it would have furnished many objections to the adversaries of the Apostles, of which objections however we hear nothing. When Paul, for example, reasoned out of the Scriptures, and disputed with the Jews, in the Synagogues at Thessalonica and Athens, he of course spoke in the Greek language, and must have made his quotations from the Scriptures in the same language, in order to have been understood by his hearers. Now if there had been no Greek version already in general use, the Apostle would have had to contend at every step, not only for his doctrine, but for his translation.

In some few instances the quotations in the New Testament do not accord with the Greek Septuagint. The differences are, however, both few in number, and of little importance; and it is indeed surprising, that after the lapse of so many ages, and after so many copies of the Septuagint had been made, before the art of printing was known, so few discrepancies should exist between the texts as quoted by the Apostles, and the same texts as they now stand in

our present editions of the Greek translation. St. Jerom, at least as far as we are aware, was the only father of the Church who questioned, whether the writers of the New Testament made their quotations from the Septuagint; but the unavailing objections of Jerom were victoriously refuted in the epistles addressed to him by St. Augustin.

It is stated by Rab. Azar, that by a decree of the Talmudists, the law was not permitted to be written in any foreign language except Greek. Now this exception would not have been made in favour of the Greek language by the Talmudists, if ancient custom had not long before authorised the use of the Septuagint among the Hellenists. But this decree appears to have been contained in the Jerusalem Talmud, of which the part called the Mishna was completed in the second century, and the part called the Gemara, or commentary on the Mishna, was completed in the third century after the Christian æra. We are likewise told by Tertullian, who flourished towards the end of the second century, that the Jews openly read the Greek

version every Sabbath, on paying a tribute for the permission.

Such is the reasoning which induces us to reject the notion of those writers, who have fancied that the Greek version which we call the Septuagint, is not the same with that written by the 72 interpreters, and that it was not composed until the beginning of the 3d century. We have endeavoured to compress our observations into a narrow space; but we trust we have said enough to justify our own opinion, and to refute that of our adversaries. We are told, that some members of the orthodox party, misled by their zeal, gave to a new version the name of that which had been composed in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and we are warned not to give countenance to the pious fraud. This accusation appears to us to be totally unfounded. The authenticity of the Septuagint was admitted by all the ancient theologians of the Christian world, with the exception of Jerom, by whom at one period it was not disputed, as Augustin reminds him. Councils declared in its favour; and it was universally received as the

genuine version made by the 72 interpreters. How indeed can it be supposed, that a new translation could have been palmed upon the world as an ancient one, at a period when all mankind were disturbed by religious dissensions; when Jews were struggling against Christians, and Christians against Pagans; and when the safety of the Church was menaced by the feuds and quarrels of her refractory sons? Had any members of the orthodox party attempted to put in practice such a deception as has been attributed to them, can we really believe that the more conscientious, or even the more prudent, persons belonging to that party would have become either their dupes or their accomplices? The vigilance of their enemies would not have been slow to detect and expose the imposture; and Pagans, Jews, and heretics, would have made the world ring with their clamours against men, who could be guilty of such an unworthy fraud, while they pretended to be the sole teachers of the pure and genuine doctrines of the Christian religion. But no dispute, no contention, appears to have arisen on this subject. The new versions of Aquila,

Theodotion, and Symmachus, were soon abandoned without a struggle; and the Septuagint was received and read in the churches without a murmur.

3. We must not, however, quit our scriptural authorities without answering the argument founded on the passage quoted from the prophet Amos. The meaning of that passage appears to have been totally mistaken by our opponents. The brotherly covenant of which the prophet speaks was no other than the friendly, or in the Oriental style the brotherly, covenant, which was established between Solomon and Hiram. The Tyrians had broken this alliance, and were condemned accordingly. Our explanation of the passage is founded on that which is given by Jerom: *Quærimus, quomodo Tyrii sint fratres Judæorum. Fratres hic amicos vocat, et necessitudine copulatos, eo quod Hiram Princeps Tyri cum David et Salomone habuerit amicitias.* The words of Amos consequently contain nothing from which it can possibly be inferred, that the Phœnicians were descended from the Edomites.

4. The objections made to the testimony of

Sanchoniatho seem to us to be equally unfounded. The Phœnician, as Bochart has clearly proved, was the same language as the Hebrew, but distinguished from it by some dialectical differences. Thus the Phœnicians, like the Chaldeans, frequently added an *aleph* to words, which in Hebrew terminated with a consonant. We may consequently conclude, that the name which was written כנען, *Cnan*, or, as the Masorites point it, *Canaan*, in Hebrew would be often written כנענא, *Cnana*, or *Canaana*, in Phœnician. Now when Philo Byblius had to put this name into Greek letters, he may have abbreviated it *causa euphoniæ*. The Greeks, as every one knows, were in the constant habit of altering foreign names; and the change made by the translator of Sanchoniatho on that in question ought to excite no surprise.

Eusebius has been censured for citing Alexander Polyhistor and Eupolemus. These writers have no doubt related many fictions; but truths are mingled with the fictions; and for this reason their works might have been occasionally consulted with profit. The passage, in

which Canaan is said to be the progenitor of the Phœnicians, is only cited upon our side to show, that the traditions, from which Eupolemus and Polyhistor drew their information, were in perfect harmony, upon this point, with the sacred Scriptures.

The objection made to the testimony of Augustin is yet more misplaced. The Bishop of Hippo might not have been able to read the Hebrew language like a master in Israel; and yet he might surely have been able to put a question in Punic to the people among whom he lived.

According to Manetho, as cited by Julius Africanus, the 15th Egyptian dynasty was composed of six shepherd-kings, who came from Phœnice. If we believe Eusebius, who likewise cites Manetho, it was the 17th dynasty which was composed of Phœnician shepherds. It has been argued, that these were the Canaanites, who were expelled from Tyre and Tsidon by the Erythræans; but if this had been the case, and if the Canaanites were a distinct race from the Phœnicians, Manetho, and the two editors

of his chronological system, have evidently committed an error in confounding the Canaanites with the Phœnicians. How then can we trust to this evidence at all? If Manetho called the people Phœnicians, whom the Phœnicians themselves expelled from their country, he could not have been very accurately acquainted with the history which he pretended to relate. In fact he has elsewhere stated these shepherds to have been Arabs. (Joseph. contr. Apion.) It is in vain then to argue from a doubtful etymology, that the strangers were Canaanites. Besides, the name of *Pachnan* is written *Apachnas* in Josephus. How indeed can it be imagined that the little territory of Phœnice could send forth a colony sufficiently numerous to subdue the kingdom of Egypt without even fighting a battle, as we are expressly told by Manetho? The strangers were called *Uk-sos*, or *Huk-sos*, in Egyptian—*Βασιλεῖς ποιμένες*, *king-shepherds*. But at what period of time was Phœnice a pastoral country? Who has ever heard of the flocks of Tsidon, or of the herds of Tyre?

The etymologies which have been proposed

for the word Φοίνιξ, *Phoinix*, are no doubt untenable; nor shall we support that which has been most generally received on the authority of Bochart, though it be favourable to our argument. If the Greeks corrupted *Beni-Anak* first into *Pheni-Anak*, and afterwards into *Phoinikes*, how came they to give the name of *phoinix* not only to the palm-tree, but also to the celebrated bird which was known by the same appellation? Had the Tsidonians and Tyrians been descendants of Anak, they would most probably have been, at least occasionally, so denominated by the sacred writers. But we have no pretext for denying the Canaanites and Phœnicians to have been the same people, because etymologists have hitherto failed in attempting to trace the word *phoinix* to its origin.

5. We have however yet to meet our opponents on their vantage ground. The authority of Herodotus is cited against us. Not only did the Persians assert that the Phœnicians came from the coast of the Erythræan sea, but the Phœnicians themselves made the same statement. Herodotus had been at Tyre. It is

difficult to suppose him to have mistaken the meaning of what had been told to him both by the Persians and by the Phœnicians. We cannot consequently be surprised at the impression, which the testimony of this historian has made on those from whom we differ. Neither can we wonder, if some, who agree upon other points with ourselves, have endeavoured so to explain the words of Herodotus, as to render them consistent with their own opinion. Thus it is said that the Canaanites, before taking possession of Phœnice, had dwelt on the borders of the Arabian Gulph, which formed part of the Erythræan sea; that the Phœnician or Canaanite shepherds, after having been expelled from Egypt, sojourned on the Arabian side of the Red sea, before they settled on the coast of Syria; and finally, that Herodotus, having heard one, or both, of these accounts, concluded, that the Phœnicians had originally come from the coast of the Erythræan sea, or rather from that part of it which is called the Arabian Gulph.

We shall not attempt to reconcile the statement of the father of history with our own senti-

ments. There is no reason to think, that Herodotus had ever heard of those Phœnician shepherds, who, if we credit Manetho, conquered all Egypt without fighting a battle. Not a word is said of them in the Euterpe. The supposition, that the Canaanites, who inhabited Phœnice, had previously dwelt on the borders of the Arabian Gulph, is founded on no historical evidence whatever. The sacred historian tells us, that Tsidon was the first-born of Canaan; and this is quite sufficient to prove the fallacy of the conjecture, which would place the first settlement of the Canaanites on the coast of the Red sea. Herodotus states in general terms, that, according to the accounts which he had received, the Phœnicians had come from the shores of the Erythræan sea; and we may seem at liberty to name either the Arabian Gulph, or the Persian Gulph, or the sea which laves the southern coast of Arabia. But a little reflection must show us our mistake, and oblige us to restrict the meaning of Herodotus to the Persian Gulph. The Persians asserted that the Phœnicians had come from the coast of the

Erythræan sea. How could this have been known to the Persians, if the Arabian Gulph had been the part of the Erythræan sea, from the shores of which the Phœnicians had originally come? Besides, Strabo (p. 42.), in speaking of this subject, mentions the report of the Tsidonians having come from the borders of the Persian Gulph. We may likewise observe, that when the Samaritans claimed descent from the Tsidonians, they stated themselves to have been originally a Persian colony. (Joseph. Antiq. L. 12. c. 5.) When therefore Herodotus spoke of the Erythræan sea, he evidently meant, in this instance at least, the Persian Gulph.

We have thus fairly and fearlessly stated the evidence of the Greek historian, which forms the main stay of the argument of our opponents, but which has not induced us to alter our opinion; *first*, because, as we have already proved, that opinion is supported by the authority of the sacred writers; and, *secondly*, because the report recorded by Herodotus might have easily arisen out of the facts which we are about to mention.

The Persians, or more properly the Iranians,

had extended their empire, at a very early period, over the greater part, if not the whole, of western Asia, which, according to their historians, was designated by the name of Magrab. When Abraham went to reside at Chebron, the kings of the districts in his neighbourhood were the vassals of the king of Iran, or Ilan, which name the Hebrews corrupted into *Eilam* (עילם). Thus the dominions of the Iranian monarch extended nearly to the Arabian Gulph, and to the frontiers of Egypt; and it may be fairly presumed that all the Canaanite tribes had submitted to his sway, until the 13th year of the reign of Chedarlaomer, when the five kings, named in the 14th chapter of the book of Genesis, took up arms against that prince, who having defeated them, and taken many prisoners, among whom was Lot, retired with his booty to Dan, where he was attacked by Abraham, who pursued him to Hobah, on the left of Damascus, and consequently beyond the limits of the country then inhabited by the Canaanite tribes. The city of Dan appertained at that period to the Tsidonians. (Judg. xix.) It was

situate near to the river of the same name, in the district afterwards occupied by the tribe of Naphtali; and when the Romans became masters of Judea, it received the appellation of Cæsarea Philippi. The Canaanite name of this city was Laish, or Leshem, before it was occupied by a colony of the tribe of Dan, who called it after their progenitor. Now although the narrative in the book of Genesis be extremely concise, we may yet draw from it the following inferences. During the period that the Persians remained sovereigns of the land of Canaan, many Persian families may have emigrated from their own country, and have quitted the coasts of the Persian Gulph in order to establish themselves on those of the Mediterranean. The Persians were civilised before the Syrians; and they may have considered Tsidon as advantageously situated for carrying on commerce; and many of them may in consequence, while they were yet masters of the soil, have settled among the Canaanites. Dan, to which city Chedarlaomer had gone after his victory in the vale of Siddim, was one day's journey from the great plain of

Tsidon. (Joseph. Antiq. L. 5. c. 3.) Abraham attacked the Persians and their allies during the night (Joseph. Antiq. L. 1. c. 10.); and although the king of Iran and his vassal kings may have escaped to Hobah, in the neighbourhood of Damascus, with the greater number of their troops, who had saved themselves from the carnage at Dan, yet many probably fled, in the midst of the confusion, in different directions, and might have taken refuge in Tsidon and Tyre, the first of which cities was about 25, and the second only about 20 geographical miles from the place of action.

In one or other, or in both of these ways, many natives of Persia may have settled in Phœnice. When Herodotus visited that country, it was under the dominion of Artaxerxes; and its inhabitants may all alike have been ambitious of claiming kindred with their Persian masters. Tradition may have told them that Cyrus was not the first monarch, who had reigned over all the regions from the Indus to the Mediterranean. They may have heard of the unfortunate prince, who was once their sovereign, and who

with his vassal kings of Shinaar, Elsar, and Goim, was driven beyond the mountains of Lebanon by the Hebrew patriarch; and they may have thought it, and indeed have found it their interest, to vaunt their descent from a people who had dwelt on the coast of the Erythræan sea, by which they meant the shores of Iran, which were washed by the waves of the sea of Ormus.

6. We have now to consider the passage quoted from Pliny. It seems to us to be by no means a necessary consequence, that the Tyrians called the island Erythia by that name, because their progenitors came from the coast of the Erythræan sea. In the first place, this name must have been a Greek translation from Edom; and in the second place, we know of no island in the Erythræan sea which was called Edom, and which could have suggested to the Tyrians the idea of so naming the island in question. The colour of the soil probably gave rise to the appellation, if indeed the real appellation has been rightly given.

Our opponents, in citing Pliny's words, should

have stated the whole passage—*Ab eo latere quo Hispaniam spectat (Gadis insula) passibus fere centum, altera insula est longa III. M. P., M. lata, in quâ prius oppidum Gadium fuit. Vocatur ab Ephoro et Philistide Erythia, a Timæo et Sileno Aphrodisias, ab indigenis Junonis. Erythia dicta est, quoniam Tyrii aborigines eorum orti ab Erythræo mari ferebantur.* Let us observe that the island was named after Venus by some, and was called the island of Juno by the native inhabitants themselves. A question may then arise, whether the Greeks did not at first call it Ilithyia, which name was afterwards corrupted into Erythia? Ilithyia was the appellation of Juno Lucifera among the Romans (*Εἰλείθυιαν Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν Ἥραν φωσφόρον*, Dionys. Halic. L. 4.); but the Greeks more frequently applied this name to Diana and the Moon. (Orpheus in Hymn. Plutarch. Sympos. L. 3.) The same goddess was sometimes addressed as the daughter of Juno, and as presiding over the births of children. Thus Pindar—

Εἰλείθυια, πάρεδρος Μοιρᾶν βαθυφρόνων,
Παῖ μεγαλοσθενέος, ἄκουσον,

Ἥρας, γενέτειρα τέκνων· ἄνευ σέθεν
Οὐ φάος, οὐ μέλαιναν δρακέντες εὐφρόναν
Τεὰν ἀδελφεὰν ἐλάχομεν
Ἀγλαόγυιον ἦβαν.

Carm. 7. Nem.

O thou, assistant of deep-minded Fates,
Ilithyïa, mighty Juno's daughter,
Goddess producing children, hear! Without thee
Nor Day should we have seen, nor yet black Night
Thy sister; though our lot it be to wear
The beauteous forms of youth.

Hesiod had already said, that Juno had brought forth Hebe, Mars, and Ilithyia.

Ἡ δ' Ἥβην, καὶ Ἄρηα, καὶ Εἰλείθυιαν ἔτικτεν.

It appears then from these authorities, that Ilithyia had been reckoned from a very early period among the divinities of Greece. But there can be little question whence the Greeks derived the name and the worship of this goddess, who was clearly the same with the Juno Lucina of the Romans. The moon had been personified in Asia from the most remote ages as the goddess presiding over parturition. The Greeks generally rendered the different names

of this deity by Aphrodite; but it would have been more accurate to have named her Ilithyia. Herodotus says, *Καλέουσι δὲ Ἀσσύριοι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην Μύλιτταν, Ἀράβιοι δὲ Ἀλίτταν, Πέρσαι δὲ Μίτραν. The Assyrians call Aphrodite (or Venus) Mylitta, the Arabians Alitta, the Persians Mitra.* Now *Mylitta* is clearly to be derived from the Hebrew ילד *yalad*, or the Chaldaic ילד *yelid*, or the Syriac ܝܠܕ *yelad, genuit;* and from which we have the formatives מילדת, *miledeth*, and ܡܘܠܕܬܐ *muldiitha, obstetrix.* It has been thought by some, that the name of the Arabian goddess *Alilat* was likewise to be traced to the Arabic verb ولد *valad, genuit;* but in this case the name would have been مولدة, *Mulidet, obstetrix*, as in the other dialects. *Alilat*, الٰيلة, of which Herodotus has made Alitta, was the appellation of the goddess of the night, or was rather the night personified. The name comes from ليل, *lial, nox.* In Hebrew ליל, *lial*, likewise signifies *nox;* and the idolatrous Jews, and perhaps some among them who would have rejected that epithet, believed that לילית *Lilith* was the mother of evil dæmons. But the Lilith of the Jews was no

other than the Alilat of the Arabians. The word لَيْلَة, *lilat*, signifies night in Arabic; and Alilat, or Allilat, seems to be *lilat*, preceded by the article—*al lilat*. The goddess, who represented the night, could not long remain unconnected with the moon. Accordingly Assemani, in his history of religious sects in the East, tells us that the ancient Arabians worshipped, among their fabulous deities, one whom they called Alilat, and who they said was the Moon, as being the queen of the night. Thus Mylitta, or Milidtha, as the Babylonians probably called her, was the sister goddess of Alitta, or Alilat. To these two sisters we may add a third, and the same whom the Greeks called Ilithyia, if indeed this last should not be rather identified with Mylitta. ילדתא, *iledetha*, or *ilidtha*, in Chaldaic, signifies *genetrix*; nor can there be much doubt, as has been already stated, that Ilithyia was originally an eastern name, derived from ילד *ilad*, or *yalad*, as you choose to pronounce it. Now as the Tyrians, who were the first settlers in the island in question, named it after Juno, we may well infer, that whatever its Phœ-

nician name might have been, whether Lilitha, or Iledtha, Muldiitha, or Alilat, it was more probably called Ilithyia by the Greeks in the early ages than Erythia, which seems to have been a corruption made in later times of the original name. This too was the more likely to have happened, that other islands were known to the Greeks by the name of Erythia, among which we may reckon that mentioned by Hesiod in his Theogony—

Χρυσάωρ δ' ἔτεκε τρικάρηνον Γηρυονῆα,
Μιχθεὶς Καλλιρόῃ κούρῃ κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο.
Τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ἐξενάριξε βίη Ἡρακληείη,
Βουσὶ παρ' εἰλιπόδεσσι περιῤῥύτῳ ἐν Ἐρυθείῃ,
Ἤματι τῷ ὅτε περ' βοῦς ἤλασεν εὐρυμετώπους
Τίρυνθ' εἰς ἱερήν, διαβὰς πόρον ὠκεανοῖο,
Ὄρθον τε κτείνας, καὶ βουκόλον Εὐρυτίωνα,
Σταθμῷ ἐν ἠερόεντι, πέρην κλυτοῦ ὠκεανοῖο.

Three-headed Geryon Chrysaor begot,
On fair Callirhoë, old Ocean's daughter.
Him did the might of Hercules assail,
And spoil him of his cloven-footed herds,
In Erythia's wave-surrounded isle.
Ev'n on the day he drove the lowing steers
Broad-fronted, to Tirynthus' sacred shrine,
The ocean he had passed, and Orthus slain,

And killed that herdsman in his darksome shed,
Eurythion, far beyond the sounding main.

But Geryon reigned in Epirus, as the learned Bochart has proved; and consequently the Erythia, of which Hesiod speaks, must have been an island near to the coast of that country. (Phaleg. L. 1. c. 34.) The Greeks of later times seem to have confounded this island with the island of Ilithyia.

7. We have now fully replied to the arguments of our opponents. It only remains for us to correct the mistake into which they have fallen, in confounding the Edomites with the Homerites. The Edomites were the descendants of Esau; but the Homerites took their name and their origin from Homyar, or Himeyar, who was the fourth in descent from Joctan the son of Heber. The real name of the city, erroneously called Himyra, was Symira; and is so written both by Ptolemy and by Pliny. In Strabo this name is ill printed *Ταξύμιρα* for *τὰ Ξύμιρα*. (Casaubon.) The city was apparently founded by the Symarites, or Tsemarites, one of the Canaanite tribes.

To the attempt to prove the curse against Canaan not to have been fulfilled against the Phœnicians, we deem no answer necessary, because history has made it for us. Phœnicia, it is true, reigned for centuries the queen of the ocean; Tsidon was the mart of the world; and Tyre was *a crowning city*. But how sad has been the downfal of all this greatness! Phœnicia returned to her hire; and Tyre, after seventy years of thraldom, again sang as a harlot. *Take thy harp*, said the prophet, *go about the city, thou harlot, that hast been forgotten, make sweet melody, sing many songs, that thou mayest be remembered!* The persecuted slaves of Babylon, the Phœnicians wore lighter chains under the successive empires of Persia, Greece, and Rome; but the curse of Canaan was upon them. They were the commercial agents of subjugated nations—the carriers of the trade of countries less humiliated than their own—ministers to the wants of the needy—panders to the appetites of the luxurious—in every sense of the term, the servants of servants. Hear the words of a profane writer, who must have been an utter stranger to

the prediction of Noach against Canaan, and who yet testifies that those proud and wealthy Phœnicians, whose navies traversed the ocean, and whose colonies rose into mighty states, actually became the subjects, and finally the victims of their own servants and slaves—*ibi (nempe in urbe Tyri) Persarum bellis diu varieque fatigati, victores (Phœnices) quidem fuere; sed attritis viribus, a servis suis multitudine abundantibus indigna supplicia perpessi sunt: qui, conspiratione facta, omnem liberum populum cum dominis interficiunt; atque ita, potiti urbe, lares dominorum occupant, rempublicam invadunt, conjuges ducunt, et, quod ipsi non erant, liberos procreant.* (Justin. L. 18. c. 3.) Will it now be doubted that the curse of Canaan was fulfilled against the Phœnicians—the servants—nay more—the victims, of servants? And what is now the fate of *the virgin daughter of Tsidon?* Her harp is unstrung; her songs have ceased; the noise of the waves resounds on her desolate coast; but the voice of her multitudes is heard no more. Tyre has become like the top of a rock, where the fisherman spreads his nets. The inhabitants of the once

rich and flourishing Phœnice are reduced to the state of degraded slaves, that live and tremble, unhappy yet obedient, under the iron rule of the most barbarous tyrants that have ever trampled under foot the liberties of nations. The modern Syrians are the slaves of pachas, themselves the servants of the Ottoman emperor, and the instruments of the tyrannical decrees of the Turkish divan. The curse against Canaan still rests on the land, which was originally peopled by his progeny.

CHAPTER III.

Of the geographical situation of Phœnice.

THE country known to the Greeks by the name of Phœnice was bounded on the west by the Mediterranean sea; and on the east by the mountains of Judea and Syria. Its northern frontier according to Ptolemy was limited by the course of the Eleutherus, now called the Nahar el Jebr, or Jebir, the Great River; and its southern extremity, (at least while Judea yet existed as a kingdom,) reached no further than the stream called Kison, and the city of Accho, or Aco, named St. John D'Acre by the modern Europeans. When however Phœnice and Palestine fell under the dominion of the Romans, the Tyrians appear to have claimed and to have obtained possession of the country beyond the

Kison. Their masters were probably better disposed towards them than towards the turbulent and untractable Jews, who had formerly occupied the coast from Mount Carmel to Jamnia. We accordingly find Sycaminos and Dora, cities which were situate to the south of the gulph of Accho, included by Ptolemy in the Phœnician territory. The distance from Accho to the isle of Arad, near the mouth of the river Eleutherus, from south to north, may be reckoned, without including the sinuosities of the coast, at about 150 English miles. The mean breadth of the Phœnician territory can hardly be estimated at more than 30 of these miles.

The city of St. John D'Acre, called עכו, *Aco*, by the Hebrews and Syrians; ﻋﻜﻪ, *Ake*, by the Arabians; and Ptolemais by the Greeks, has been more famous in modern, than it was in ancient story. It is said to be agreeably situated in a plain, on the shore of the bay to which it gives its name. The mountains belonging to the chain of the Anti-Libanus are seen at the distance of about four leagues to the north; and

the prospect towards the east is terminated by the fruitful hills of the lower Galilee. The western side of the city is washed by the waves of the Mediterranean. To the south lies a small but commodious bay, crowded no more with the ships of many nations; and beyond it may be seen the city of Caipha, the ruins of the ancient Calamon, and rising high above both, the vine-covered heights of Carmel. The plain, in which Acre stands, is watered by the streams of the Kison and the Belus. The first of these rivers, a strong and rapid torrent often mentioned by the sacred writers, rises at the foot of Mount Tabor; and the second has its source in a marsh, to which Pliny (L. 5. c. 19.) gives the Latinised name of Cendivia. No mention is made in Scripture of the Belus; but Josephus (De Bell. Jud. L. 2. c. 10.) says that at the distance of two stadia from Ptolemais flows the very small river of Beleus, (for so he terms it,) and near it, he adds, is the monument of Memnon. This Memnonian monument is likewise mentioned by Strabo (L. 15.) on the authority of Simonides. Memnon, says this great geogra-

pher, is reported to have been buried about Paltus of Syria by the river Bada. (*Περὶ Πάλτον τῆς Συρίας παρὰ Βαδᾶν ποταμόν.*) Paltus is probably a corruption of בעלת *Baalath;* and as Pliny distinctly calls the rivulet Belus, and Josephus Beleus, we may believe Bada to be also a corruption for בעל *Baal,* to which deity the stream may have been consecrated by his Phœnician worshippers.

The city of Aco, or Ake, obtained its denomination, according to a story related by Pliny, (L. 36. c. 65.) because Hercules had been cured in this place of the wounds which he had received in his combat with the Lernæan Hydra. This story seems to have been originally invented by some Greek mythologist, who derived the name of Ake from the verb *ἀκέομαι, medeor.* It is however remarkable, that this name can be traced to no Hebrew or Syriac root, and is clearly of Arabic origin, and is to be derived from عك *ak,* which signifies *sultry.* The neighbourhood of Ake was famous for its sands, which the Sidonians employed in making glass. (Plin. L. 5. c. 19. Strabo L. 16.) The Arabians

denote a sandy shore heated by the Sun by the word عكه *akeh*, or عكة *aket*, or (with the nunnation) *aketon*. Strabo mentions, that the ancient name of the city was Ake, and that the Persians had employed it as a military station against Egypt. (L. 16.)

The small city, now called Zib, is situate on the coast, about nine or ten English miles to the north of Acre. It is named אכזיבה, *Aczibah*, in Scripture. (Josh. xix.) Pliny calls it Acdippus; but Josephus, (Antiq. L. 5.) who writes the name Ectippos in one place, and Ecdippon in another, (De Bell. Jud. L. 1.) intimates that it was called Arke by the Greeks. The name appears to have been originally derived from the Persian, and the place was called زاب *zab*, or *zeb*, which signifies a fountain. To *zeb* was added the Arabic word اك *ak*, hot; and thus the name indicated that the small town in question had been so denominated from a hot spring. The modern inhabitants call it زيب, *zib*, and thus have changed the name, which signified a fountain, into one which signifies a wolf.

The celebrated city, which we have learned

from the Greeks to call Tyre, has always been known to the Orientalists by the name of Sur, or Tsor, or Tsur. This name is written צור in Chaldaic characters, and is generally supposed to signify a rock, which meaning it undoubtedly bears in the Hebrew language. New Tyre was situate on a rock, and the appellation was consequently suited to the place; but this does not appear to have been the case with regard to old Tyre. The new city was built on an island, which was originally a barren rock; but Palætyrus was situate on the continent, about 3 miles from the sea, and the plain where it stood is 4 or 5 miles in breadth. There seems, therefore, to be no reason why Tsur should have been originally so called, if this name had been understood as signifying a rock. A palm-tree was the favourite emblem of the Tyrians. The spot, where their city was founded, might have been originally called the place of the palm-tree, which tree is indigenous in Phœnice. The Arabians have always called Tyre صور ‖ *Al Sur, the palm-tree.* (Gol. in voce.) Hence perhaps the Greeks gave the name of *phoinix* to this tree, as being the

natural production of Phœnice, and as being the common emblem both of the Phœnicians and of their colonists.

It may have happened then, that ancient Tyre, which was situated in a plain, may have been called *Al Sur*, as the place where the palm-tree flourished. In fact Sanchoniatho mentions that there were originally many trees in Tyre. When the Tyrians were forced to occupy the island, on which new Tyre was built, the name might have been easily changed to *Tsur*, *a rock*. Strangers might have confounded *Sur*, with *Tsur*; and the Greeks gave the name of *Tur* both to the old city and to the new.

We first hear of Tyre in the book of Joshua. (c. xix.) ועד עיר מבצר צר, which words are rendered in the Vulgate, *ad civitatem munitissimam Tyrum*. I have doubts of the accuracy of this version. I would translate the passage, *ad urbem prope rupem Tyri*. The city in question was therefore that which the Greeks called Palæ-tyrus. I need scarcely notice to the Hebraist, that I take the מ in מבצר for the preposition; and that I consequently do not read מבצר as one

word, or as being the participial noun signifying *munitio.* בצר signifies *petra, rupes.* (See Simon's Lexicon.)

The next mention of Tyre is in the second book of Samuel (c. xxiv.) ויבאו מבצר צר—*transierunt prope mœnia Tyri.* I would rather translate *transierunt prope rupem Tyri.* In the English version the difficulty is avoided—*and came to the strong hold of Tyre.* This might be either a rock, or a fortification.

Various are the opinions concerning the origin of Tyre, and the date when it was founded. Herodotus (L. 2. c. 44.) says, that he was told by the priests of Tyre, that the temple of Hercules was as ancient as the city, which had been already built 2300 years. According to this account Tyre was founded about the year 2760 before the Christian æra, 469 years after the deluge, according to the chronology of the LXX. But Tyre is called by Isaiah the daughter of Tsidon; and may consequently be considered as having been founded by a Tsidonian colony. There appears then scarcely sufficient time for the establishment of this colony between the

epoch of the deluge, and the period stated in Herodotus as that of the building of Tyre. The city of Tsidon was founded by the son of Canaan; and this son of Canaan, according to the chronology of the Vulgate, was born about 130 years after the deluge. It seems hardly probable, that the descendants of Tsidon became so numerous in the course of less than three centuries and a half, as to send out colonies, and to build new cities. The temple of Hercules, which was coeval with the city, is described as magnificent by Herodotus; and such a structure could scarcely have been raised at so early a period. Besides, the city and temple, of which Herodotus speaks, were situate on the island; and as old Tyre necessarily existed before the city mentioned by the historian, it becomes still more difficult to assign to it the antiquity, which was claimed for it by the priests.

Josephus (Antiq. L. 8. c. 3.), on the other hand, has assigned too recent a date to the building of Tyre, which he pretends took place only 240 years before the building of the temple of Jerusalem. But the foundations of this temple

were laid, according to Usher, in the year 1012 before Christ; and according to the same chronologer, Tyre already existed as a city about 1444 years before our æra.

For the same reason we must reject the opinion of some authors cited by Cedrenus, who date the foundation of Tyre from the year 351 before the building of Solomon's temple. Neither can we hesitate to refuse our assent to the statement of Justin, who fixes the beginning of the building of Tyre for the year before the capture of Troy, which event could not have happened, taking the earliest date that can be well assigned to it, for 150 years after the death of Joshua. It is likewise pretended by Justin (L. 18. c. 3.), that Tyre was founded by the Tsidonians, who had been driven out of their city by a king of Ascalon. But Tyre lay between Tsidon and Ascalon. The map refutes Justin. This author may not, however, be the less accurate in ascribing the building of Tyre to the Tsidonians.

If we believe some of the ancient mythologists,

Tyre was founded by Agenor, the son of Neptune and Libya, and the father of Cadmus, Syrus, Cilix, Phœnix, and Europa. The daughter of Agenor was remarkable for her beauty, and Jupiter became enamoured of her charms. The God assumed the form of a bull, and presented himself before the princess, as she gathered flowers in a meadow. Pleased with the gentleness of this beautiful bull, Europa was induced to mount upon his back; but she had no sooner done so, than he bore her off to the shore, plunged into the sea, and swam away with her to Crete. In the mean time the brothers of Europa pursued her ravisher without success. Syrus, Cilix, and Phœnix, returned to Asia, where they gave the names of Syria, Cilicia, and Phœnice, to the different countries over which they reigned. Cadmus travelled into Bœotia, where he killed a dragon, that had devoured his companions; and having sown the teeth of this dragon in the ground, a number of armed men sprang out of the earth, who all destroyed each other except five, with the assistance of whom he built Bœotian Thebes; that

part of it excepted, which rose to the music of Amphion's lyre.

One might think it only necessary to read this story to be convinced that it was a fable; and that all the persons named in it were merely imaginary. This however has not been the case. Herodotus has mentioned, that the Phœnicians, who pursued Europa, planted a colony in the isle of Thasos, five generations before the birth of the Grecian Hercules the son of Amphitryon; and learned commentators, and grave chronologers, have written long dissertations to show, in what manner this statement can be reconciled with the genealogies of Agenor and Hercules.

The Greeks appear to have thought, that Tyre was founded by an African colony which came by sea to Phœnice; and hence they feigned Agenor to have been the son of Neptune and Libya. But so little attentive were they to consistency, that they have given a Greek name to an African prince. According to some writers, Agenor was the brother of Belus, whom Diodorus Siculus makes a native of Egypt. Nonnus mentions Agenor as an inhabitant of

Egyptian Thebes. From Egypt he is said to have gone to Phœnice, where he founded the city of Tyre. But how came this prince to obtain his Greek name of Agenor (Ἀγήνωρ), which signifies *fortis, strenuus, validus?* Diodorus says that Belus went from Egypt into Chaldea; but Apollodorus tells us that this prince never quitted Egypt.

The strange story concerning Cadmus may be in some measure explained as follows. A Phœnician colony appears to have settled in Bœotia, where they instructed the rude natives, and taught them the use of letters. These Phœnicians probably said, that they were בני קדים, *Beni Kadim*, sons of the East—or that they came מהקדים, *me ha Kadim*, from the East—or that they were קדמונים, *Kademonim*, Orientalists. Hence the fiction concerning Cadmus. Other Phœnician colonies had been already established; and one of these had probably settled in Crete. The Phœnicians designated the countries which lay to the west of their own, and beyond the seas, by the word ערב, which may be sounded *arab*, *ereb*, or *orob*; or ערבא *araba*, or

ערבה *erabah*. This word, signifying *west*, was that by which the Babylonians indicated the country to the west of their own; and which we call Arabia to this day, with little attention to the origin of the name. In like manner our quarter of the globe was called by the same name, and for the same reason, by the Phœnicians; but the Greeks altered *Araba*, or *Eroba*, into Europa; and in the spirit of their fanciful mythology represented a Phœnician colony by a young princess, who was carried away from her native country to Crete by Jupiter under the shape of a bull. The meaning of the fable, however, becomes obvious, when we reflect that Crete lay לערב, *l'oreb*, to the west of Phœnice; that the Phœnicians, who settled there, would naturally introduce into that island the rites of their own religion; and that they were worshippers of the tauriform idol of Baal, or Beel, held by the Greeks to be the same with Zeus. Thus we may consider the son of Neptune and Libya—that Egyptian with a Greek name, who was also the founder of the city of Tyre—together with his children, after whom half the countries of the known world

were called—to have had no other existence than that which was imagined by the ancient mythologists, and which has since been admitted by the complying complaisance of modern writers.

Sanchoniatho, as reported by Philo Byblius, (Euseb. Pr. Ev. L. 1.) tells us that Tyre was first inhabited by Hypsouranios, and that it then consisted of sheds built up with canes, rushes, and papyri:—*εἶτά φησι τὸν Ὑψουράνιον οἰκῆσαι Τύρον, καλύβας τε ἐπινοῆσαι ἀπὸ καλάμων καὶ θρύων καὶ παπύρων.* This Hypsouranios, whose name signifies *celestial altitude*, was the brother of Memroumos, and both were sprung from a race of giants, after whom the neighbouring mountains had been called, and who were the sons of Eternity and the First-begotten. Hypsouranios had another brother called Ousoos, who rebelled against him, but who appears to have been very serviceable to his country. He taught men to cover their bodies with the skins of wild beasts; and the forests in the vicinity of Tyre having taken fire, Ousoos cut down a tree, and first ventured to navigate the seas. Courage at

least he must have had, (*illi robur, &c.*) The same person raised columns in honour of Fire and Wind; and introduced the use of sacrifices. It is not a little strange, however, that hunting and fishing, according to Sanchoniatho, were unknown and unpractised until long after the time of Hypsouranios: *Χρόνοις δὲ ὕστερον πολλοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ὑψουρανίου γενεᾶς γενέσθαι Ἀγρέα καὶ Ἁλιέα, τοὺς ἁλείας καὶ ἄγρας εὑρετάς.* How then did the sons of the giants, who dwelt in cabins built of reeds and rushes, find means to live; and where did they find the skins of the wild beasts with which they were clothed? Agriculture, by the writer's own account, was not practised until a much later period. Other inconsistencies occur. He says, *δένδρου δὲ λαβόμενον τὸν Οὔσωον, καὶ ἀποκλαδεύσαντα, πρῶτον τολμῆσαι εἰς θάλασσαν ἐμβῆναι*—*Ousoos, having taken the branches off a tree, first ventured to go on the sea.* But afterwards, speaking of Hephaistos, he observes that of all mankind he was the first who navigated—*πρωτόν τε πάντων ἀνθρώπων πλεῦσαι.* The whole statement attributed to Sanchoniatho, which I shall soon have occasion to develope at greater length, is

that of a mythologist, who has substituted inventions for facts, and who, where historical evidence failed him, has had recourse to fabulous traditions and allegorical fictions.

Upon the whole then I am inclined to consider the Tyrians as having been originally a Tsidonian colony. *Tradunt historiæ,* says Jerom, *quod Tyrus colonia Sidonis sit.* It is evident that Isaiah held it to be such, when he called Tyre the daughter of Tsidon. *Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed virgin, daughter of Tsidon: arise, pass over to Chittim; there also shalt thou have no rest.*

We are however ignorant of the exact æra when Tyre was founded. We can only say with certainty that it was built before the Israelites entered Palestine.

The silence of Homer concerning Tyre had probably already excited surprise in the time of Strabo. (L. 16.) The poets, says this geographer, have celebrated Sidon more than Tyre; and then he adds, "Ομηρος δὲ οὐδὲ μέμνηται τῆς Τύρου— *Homer does not even mention Tyre.* If we follow Velleius Paterculus, we shall fix the birth of

Homer for the year 968 before Christ. Herodotus says, that Homer and Hesiod lived 400 years before himself; and as the historian, according to Aulus Gellius, was born in the beginning of the 74th Olympiad, we must reckon the birth of Homer, if we adopt this account, for the year 884 before our æra. But Porphyry, cited by Suidas, says that he was born 23 years sooner; while the Arundel Marbles mark this same year, (the year 907 before Christ,) to be that when Homer flourished. Now the correspondence between Solomon and Hiram took place about the year 1014 before Christ; and even if we take the account of Herodotus as the most accurate, Homer must have flourished only about 160, or 170 years afterwards. It appears that Hiram was king of Tsidon as well as of Tyre, which had then become the place of the royal residence, and was evidently considered as the capital of Phœnice. Solomon desired that the servants of Hiram should hew cedar-trees out of Lebanon; *for thou knowest*, he adds, *that there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber, like unto the Sidonians.* (1 Kings

v. 8. From this passage we may conclude that the Tsidonians recognised the king of Tyre as their master. Eusebius (Pr. Ev. L. 9.) thus gives the address on Solomon's letter to Hiram, whom he calls Souron—*Βασιλεὺς Σολομὼν Σούρωνι τῷ Βασιλεῖ Τύρου, καὶ Σιδῶνος, καὶ Φοινίκης, φίλῳ πατρικῷ, χαίρειν—King Solomon to Souron, King of Tyre, and Sidon, and Phœnice, the friend of his father: greeting.* It would appear then, that Tsidon ranked after Tyre in the time of Hiram, and that the Tsidonians were the subjects of the Tyrian king. No change seems to have taken place down to the time when both cities were captured by Nebuchadnezzar. Josephus, it is true, mentions the revolt of Sidon and of other cities of the coast against insular Tyre, in the time of Salmanazar king of Assyria (720 years before our æra); but the Tyrians defeated the fleet of the enemy; and though Salmanazar besieged their city during five years, they held out against him, and appear after his death to have recovered their supremacy over all Phœnice (Antiq. L. 9. c. 14.) Tyre was the crowning city in the days of Isaiah; in those of Ezechiel,

the Tsidonians were employed as her mariners. Joel names Tyre before Tsidon; and it is Tyrus that Amos threatens in the name of Jehovah. There seems therefore to be no way of accounting for the silence of Homer concerning Tyre, while he mentions several times Sidon and the Sidonians, but by supposing that he lived before the time when Tyre became the capital of Phœnice. Certainly if the great poet had flourished after the re-establishment of the Olympic games by Lycurgus and Iphitus (884 years before Christ), it is strange that he should have made no mention of them. These games had been instituted by Hercules, but had fallen into disuse; and were renewed the very year Homer was born, if we follow Herodotus. His silence concerning them therefore would lead us to believe, that the author of his life has rightly fixed his birth for the year 218 before the first Olympiad of Iphitus, and for the year 168 after the capture of Troy. This city was taken by the Greeks, according to Larcher, 1270 years before Christ. Homer's birth is therefore to be reckoned for the year 1102 before our æra, and

88 years before the correspondence took place between Solomon and Hiram. The latter, according to Josephus, had then reigned 12 years. Now we hear only once in Scripture of Tyre, but frequently of Tsidon and the Tsidonians, before the time of David. The revolution (for there must have been one to raise the city of the colonists above the ancient metropolis) may have therefore taken place during the reign of that prince. But if Homer were born 1102 years before Christ, as the author of his life leads us to conclude, he flourished before David, who succeeded to Saul in the year 1056 before the Christian æra. Thus Tsidon might have been still the capital of Phœnice when Homer flourished; and if it were so, we can no longer wonder at the poet's silence concerning Tyre.

The island on which new Tyre was built was at the distance of 4 stadia from the shore, according to Diodorus Siculus (L. 17.), and Quintus Curtius (L. 4.) But Pliny says, that before Alexander joined the island to the continent by a mole, the distance between them by water was 700 paces. (L. 5. c. 19.) The same writer esti-

mates the circuit of old and new Tyre at 19 miles. New Tyre appears to have been a very magnificent city. The houses, as Strabo tells us (L. 16.), were many stories high (πολυστέγους); and were loftier than those of Rome. The temples appear to have been very splendid edifices. Herodotus (L. 2. c. 44.) mentions that in the temple dedicated to Hercules there were two columns, one of pure gold, and another of emerald, which shone during the night. But according to Menander the Ephesian, cited by Josephus, (Contr. Apion. L. 1. c. 18.) the golden column was placed by king Hiram in the temple of Jupiter. The same thing is asserted by Eupolemus, who adds that Solomon sent it to Hiram, who placed the image of his daughter upon it. (Euseb. Pr. Ev. L. 9.) This story is very improbable. Had Solomon made a gift of such value to the king of Tyre, the fact, it may be presumed, would have been recorded by the sacred writers. Much has been written about the emerald column, of which Herodotus speaks. Theophrastus (de Lapide) seems to have thought that this column was made of a pseudo-

smaragdus. But Herodotus says, that it gave a brilliant light during the night. It was probably, as is indeed now generally supposed, a hollow column of coloured glass, with lamps placed in the inside. *Les anciens*, says the President Goguet, *connoissoient aussi l'art de faire prendre au verre toutes sortes de couleurs. Je penserois donc que ces ouvrages étonnans, qu'Hérodote, Pline, et les autres auteurs disent avoir été d'émeraudes, n'étoient que de verre coloré.* And the same author observes of the column in the temple at Tyre, that it was probably glass coloured like an emerald; and adds—*elle étoit creuse, et on mettoit dedans des lampes qui la faisoient paroître lumineuse pendant la nuit.* (Orig. des Loix, vol. 2. p. 114.)

Menander of Ephesus states that Hiram destroyed the old temples, and built new ones; and among these he mentions the temples of Hercules and Astarte. This assertion is in direct contradiction to the account given by Herodotus, who visited Tyre, and who was informed by the priests that the temple of Hercules was as ancient as the city itself. But Menander,

as we learn from Josephus, had written the history of the kings of Tyre, and had consulted the records of that city. His statement is more probable than the account of Herodotus, who seems to have been imposed upon by the priests both about the temple of Hercules, and about the emerald column which adorned it.

Strabo reckons the distance between Tyre and Tsidon at 200 stadia. He probably made his calculation here by the Olympic stadium; and we may accordingly estimate the distance between the two cities at nearly 23 English miles.

As the ancient capital of Phœnice was founded by the son of Canaan, and as the earliest mention of it is to be found in the sacred Scriptures, I have generally preserved the Hebrew orthography in writing the name of צידון Tsidon. But the Hebrews became acquainted with Tsidon long after that city had been built; and it may be questioned, whether they properly pronounced the name. Some authors are of opinion that the son of Canaan was denominated Tsidon from the city which he had built; and that that city received its appellation from the

occupation of its original inhabitants, who from their situation near the coast may be supposed to have chiefly gained their livelihood by fishing. In the Syriac language ציידא *tsaida* signifies *venatio, piscatio;* and *Tsaida*, or *Saida*, is the name of the place to this day. Thus we may understand Beth-saida, which was situate near the sea of Galilee, to have originally signified *domus piscationis*, or *piscatoris*. This explanation of the name of Tsidon appears to have been received by the Romans; and Trogus Pompeius says that the city was so called *a piscium ubertate*. But strong objections may nevertheless be made to this etymology. The Hebrew verb צוד signifies *to hunt;* but there is no example to be found where this verb signifies *to fish*. Neither do any of its derivatives bear any reference to fishing. The words employed in Hebrew for this purpose are דוג, and its derivatives. It may then be suspected, that an extension of the sense has been given by the Syrians to the word *tsaida*, which is authorised neither by the Hebrew nor by the Arabic; and that though this word may have been used as Trogus seems to

have understood it, we may yet doubt whether the deviation from the proper and original sense could have existed when Tsidon first received its name. The Arabians call Tsidon صيدا, *Saida*, which scarcely differs in sound from the Syriac ܨܝܕܐ, *Tsaida;* but it differs widely in meaning. صيدي *Saidi*, in Arabic signifies brass, copper, brazen, &c.—صيدان, *saidan*, also signifies brass—صيدا, *saida*, is the substance of which vases, kettles, pans, &c. are made. Golius translates *saida—terra dura et salebrosa—lapides ex quibus cacabi aut ollæ parantur.* I cannot help suspecting that the city called *Tsidon* by the Hebrews, *Tsaid*, or *Tsaida*, by the Syrians, and *Said*, or *Saida*, by the Arabians, originally received its name from the language of the last. The Tsidonians were celebrated for their skill in metallurgy, and for the art with which they worked in gold, silver, and brass. Much iron and brass existed in Phœnice; and the possession of this country having been once intended for the tribe of Asher, Moses said to that tribe, *under thy shoes shall be iron and brass;* (Deut. xxxiii.) that is, the soil under thy feet shall abound with

iron and brass. The city called צרפת *Tsorphat* in Hebrew, and which is named Sarepta in the Vulgate, might almost be considered as one of the suburbs of Tsidon. Now this city was apparently denominated from the occupation of its inhabitants, who seem to have been workers in brass and iron; and Bochart's remark is clearly just, when he says, *nomen habet ab æris et ferri fusione.* There can indeed be no question about this. צרף *Tsaraph,* signifies *conflavit, purgavit*—the noun צרף, *tsoreph,* signifies *aurifaber, argentarius.* In Arabic صرف, *saraph,* signifies, among many other things, *excellence in the art of coining money.* But the original sense of the word *tsaraph,* or *saraph,* in all the dialects, was to change, or purify metals by means of fire; though in the Arabic, in which many roots have lost their ancient signification, this meaning is not to be traced so easily as in the Hebrew and Syriac. Now I consider Sidon, or rather Saida, to have been so called from its abounding with صيدي *saidi,* or صيدان, *saidan,* brass. Homer's authority is always great; and he thus makes the Phœnician woman speak, of whom men-

tion is made in the 15th Book of the Odyssey—

Ἐκ μὲν Σιδῶνος πολυχάλκου εὔχομαι εἶναι,
Κούρη δ' εἰμ' Ἀρύβαντος ἐγὼ ῥυδὸν ἀφνειοῖο.

I glory to be of Sidon abounding in brass, and am the daughter of the wealthy Arybas.

I have little hesitation then in referring the original name of the city in question to the Arabic *saidi*, or *saidan*; and I think Trogus, (or Justin for him,) must have been misled by an etymology imagined by the Phœnicians of later times, when he said, *a piscium ubertate Sidona appellaverunt; nam pisces Phœnices sidon vocant.* (Justin. L. 18.) The Romans seem also to have believed that Tyre, called *Sur*, or *Tsur*, by the natives, had taken its name from a fish called *Sar* in the Phœnician language. (Servius ad Virg. 2. Georg. v. 506.) Certainly if Sidon were so named from fish in general, there could be no reason why Tyre should not be called from one kind of fish in particular.

It seems to be uncertain, whether Tsidon or Tyre were the larger city. In the Book of Joshua (c. xi.) Tsidon is distinguished by the

epithet of רבה, *rabah*, great. Pomponius Mela says, that before it was taken by the Persians, (he should have said the Babylonians,) Tsidon was the greatest of maritime cities—*maritimarum urbium maxima.* (L. 1. c. 12.) Diodorus Siculus (L. 16. c. 41.) likewise extols its wealth and prosperity. There is a singular mistake, committed no doubt by the copyists, in a passage which I have quoted from Josephus in the last chapter. The Jewish antiquarian has been made to speak of *the great plain of Sidon*, instead of *the plain of great Sidon.* The plain of Tsidon, if plain it can be called, is only two miles in breadth. But from the accounts given by other authors, and perhaps especially in that fine chapter of Ezechiel, it may be thought that Tyre in the sequel must have exceeded her metropolis in wealth and splendour.

Strabo (L. 16.) estimates the distance between Tsidon and Berytus at 400 stadia. This writer probably reckoned by the length of the road which must have always been mountainous, and in his time might have been sinuous. Certain it is, that if he reckoned by Olympic stadia, he

has more than doubled the distance, as it is given in the best maps.

The modern city of Berith, or Beruth, is said to contain 20,000 inhabitants. It is pleasantly situated on the coast; and there are many fine gardens in its vicinity. It therefore still answers to the words of Dionysius Periegetes, who mentions together

> Καὶ Τύρον ὠγυγίην, Βηρυτοῦ τ' αἶαν ἐραννὴν,
> *Ogygian Tyre, and Beryth's pleasant land.*

Berith, Beryth, or Berutos, as it was generally called by the Greeks, appears to have been a city of great antiquity. According to Porphyry, Sanchoniatho was an inhabitant of Berutos, since he calls him Σαγχουνιάθων ὁ Βηρύτιος, *Sanchoniatho the Berutian.* Eusebius tells us that Sanchoniatho flourished before the Trojan times. Porphyry, according to Eusebius, gives the following account of the historian of Berutos. *Sanchoniatho the Berutian,* says he, *having obtained the records from Jerombal, the priest of the God Jeuo, relates with great veracity the history of the Jews, since it is perfectly consonant with their*

35252

places and names. He presented his history to Abibal king of the Berutians, and it was favourably received by that prince, and by those about him, who were most inquisitive in the search of truth. The times of these persons were previous to the Trojan times, and nearly approached the age of Moses, as the successions of the kings of Phœnice indicate. Sanchoniatho (in the Greek dialect Philalethes) compiled his ancient history out of the collections of political and sacred writings, about the æra of Semiramis Queen of the Assyrians, who lived before, or during the Trojan times. (The reader will observe that for Σαγχουνιάθων κατὰ τὴν Φοινίκων διάλεκτον, φιλαλήθως, &c., I read, Σαγχουνιάθων κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικῶν διάλεκτον Φιλαλήθης, &c.) Much obloquy has been thrown upon Porphyry for having said, that Semiramis lived before, (that is immediately before,) or about the Trojan times. But whatever objections may be made to Porphyry, it is scarcely to be imagined that he was utterly ignorant of history and chronology. This writer probably meant by Semiramis, not the celebrated Queen of that name, but

Atossa, also called Semiramis, whose reign commenced about 1315 years before the Christian æra, and whom I have already mentioned in my first volume. (p. 263.) Porphyry had stated, that the æra of Sanchoniatho was previous to the Trojan times, and near those of Moses. How then can he be supposed to say in the next sentence, that the Phœnician historian wrote during the reign of the first Semiramis, or that that queen lived immediately before, or about the Trojan times? The whole passage appears to have been misunderstood by Eusebius. Porphyry's statement probably was, that Sanchoniatho compiled his history out of the records, down to a period previous to the reign of Semiramis, meaning Atossa Semiramis, who lived before or about the Trojan times.

Much difference of opinion has existed concerning the origin of the name of Berytus. Sanchoniatho, as translated by Philo Byblius, says that *Elion* (עליון), whose name signifies *Highest*, and his wife called *Berout* (Βηρούτ) dwelt about Byblus. The distance of Byblus from Berytus may be 30 miles. Berytus is supposed by

some writers to have beennamed after *Berout;* and they have considered this deity, (for the wife of *Elion* must have been a goddess,) to be the same with the Baal Berith mentioned in Scripture. Jerombal mentioned by Porphyry, was the same, it is argued, with Gideon, or Gedeon, called Jerubaal; and the Israelites, immediately after the death of Gideon, made Baal Berith their God. Now allowing, what is not clear, that by Jerombal Porphyry meant Jerubaal, and admitting, what is not probable, that Jerubaal confided the sacred records to a stranger and an idolater, it by no means follows, that Baal Berith was the same with the Phœnician goddess Berout. Had this been the case the sacred historian would have probably written בעלה ברית *Baalah Berith;* (Judg. c. viii.) but the words are, ויהי כאשר מת גדעון וישובו בני ישראל ויזנו אחרי הבעלים וישימו להם בעל ברית לאלהים.—*And it happened as soon as Gedeon was dead, that the children of Israel turned back again, and went whoring after the Baalim, and set up to themselves Baal Berith for God.* Again we find the following words——; ויתנו־לו שבעים כסף מבית בעל ברית *and*

they gave him seventy pieces of silver from the temple of Baal Berith. (Judg. c. ix.) And again—וישמעו כל־בעלי מגדל שכם ויבאו אל־צריח בית אל ברית—*when all the possessors of the tower of Shekhem heard this, they entered into a fort of the temple of the God Berith.* (Ibid.) After having made these quotations, I cannot agree with those writers who would make Baal Berith the same with the Phœnician goddess Berout. The city of Sichem (as the name is written in the Vulgate) was the place where Baal Berith was worshipped; and it is difficult to conceive what intercourse could have existed between the Phœnicians, and the descendants of Ephraim, who inhabited Sichem, which was situate among the mountains, and was far remote from the Phœnician territory. Many of the Rabbin have understood by Baal Berith the *Lord of the covenant.* In the Vulgate one of the passages quoted above is thus strangely translated, *postquam mortuus est Gedeon, aversi sunt filii Israel, et fornicati sunt cum Baalim. Percusseruntque cum Baal fœdus, ut esset eis in Deum.* Munster renders the latter part of the verse, *ponentes sibi*

Baal fœdere quodam in Deum. If however by ברית, *berith*, we are to understand the Hebrew word which signifies a covenant, the version ought to have been, *ponentes sibi Baal fœderis, (vel Dominum fœderis) pro Deo.* But this deity is thought by Parkhurst to have been named בעל ברית, *Lord of purifications*, or Baal the purifier, as purification by fire no doubt existed in the rites of Baal as well as in those of Moloch. (See the word ברר, *barar*, and its derivatives.) Be this however as it may, the Israelites had turned back again to their idolatrous practices, when they set up Baal Berith in Shekhem, or Shechem, or Sichem, for a God. This worship therefore was not new to them. They had returned to it. What then becomes of Bochart's argument, when he says, *Baal Berith, id est idoli Berith seu Beryti urbis e qua oriundus Sanchoniathon, ut supra probavimus: ex quo fit verisimile, fœdus aliquod initum aut Gedeonis commercium frequens cum Berytio homine magni nominis, occasionem dedisse idololatriæ Judæis alioquin prorsus ignotæ; neque enim alibi Baal Berith nominatus uspiam.* That this idol should not be spoken of elsewhere,

than in the passages which I have cited, is nothing to the purpose. Baal was probably worshipped by the idolatrous Israelites under more names than are mentioned in Scripture. But how could Bochart suppose a close intimacy between Sanchoniatho, a worshipper of Baal and Gedeon, who was named Jerubaal, because he had thrown down the image of that deity?

Nonnus, a poet of the fifth century, pretends that the ancient name of Berytus was Beroë; and he ascribes the change of the name to the Romans. He makes a nymph of Beroë, and pursues her history through three books of the farrago, which he calls Dionysiacs. It is scarcely worth while to say more of this imaginary Beroë. The Romans changed the name of the city, not from Beroë to Berytus, but from Berytus, or rather Beruth, to *Felix Julia.* (Plin. L. 5.)

Berytus probably received its name from the wells with which it abounds. Accordingly Stephanus Byzantinus says, that the Phœnicians themselves thus accounted for the origin of the name:—*Βὴρ γὰρ τὸ φρέαρ παρ' αὐτοῖς—for with*

them beer signifies a well. The original word was therefore, either in Hebrew בארות, *beeroth*, or in Arabic بيرات, *birath*, *wells*.

The Greeks gave the denomination of Byblus to the city, which its modern inhabitants call *Gebal*, or *Jibal*, and which I have already mentioned as being about 30 miles to the north of Beruth. It is situate on a hill near the sea. Strabo says, ἡ μὲν οὖν Βύβλος τὸ τοῦ Κινύρου βασίλειον, ἱερά ἐστι τοῦ Ἀδώνιδος—κεῖται δ' ἐφ' ὕψους τινὸς μικρὸν ἄπωθεν τῆς θαλάττης—*Byblos was the royal residence of Cinyras, and here are the temples of Adonis—it lies on a height at a little distance from the sea.* The name, we are told by Casaubon, is written Παλαίβυβλος, *Palæbyblos*, old Byblus, in the manuscripts. If so, why is it printed otherwise? But Ptolemy places Παλαιόβιβλος, *Palæobiblos*, as he writes it, in the interior of the country, between Arca and Marame, and in the latitude of Botrys. This account is clearly erroneous. Arca is nearly 30 miles north-east of Botrys, and Marame, or Mariame, in the latitude of Emesa, is yet further to the north. Byblus is a corruption from the

Arabic word جبل *jabal*, or *jibal*, which signifies a hill, or mountain; but which the Greeks could not easily pronounce; the sound of the j, or rather of the soft g, not existing in their own language.

The city of Botrys, called Bostra by Strabo, was situate on the coast, about 10 miles to the north of Byblus. According to Menander, cited by Josephus, (Antiq. L. 8.) it was founded by Ithobal king of Tyre. The orthography of Strabo (*Βόστρα*) is more correct than that of Josephus and Pliny. The original name was apparently בצרה *Botsrah*, or in Arabic بصرى *Bostra*. (Gol. in voce.) Several cities in Arabia, Babylonia, and Syria, were so denominated. The name indicates that these cities were built either on rocks, or in very narrow valleys.

There is a promontory between Botrys, or Bostra, and Tripoli, which Strabo and Ptolemy denominate *Θεοῦ Πρόσωπον*, *Faciem Dei*. The original name was probably פנואל, *Penuel*, as has been suggested by Bochart. But *Πρόσωπος Θεοῦ*, *facies Dei*, is not, I should think, the proper, though at first sight it may seem the literal, trans-

lation of Penuel, or Phenuel. פנה, *pinah* or *phinah*, in Hebrew signifies an extremity, an angle. The root פנן *panan*, or *phanán*, or פן *phan*, is no longer found; but it evidently must have been the same with the Arabic ڤن *phan*. This last verb signifies, to propel, to turn, &c. In the Arabic there is no derivative from the root, which, as the language now exists, bears the same sense with פנה *pinah*, or פן, *phin*, an angle, in Hebrew; or with פנה *phaneh*, which signifies the face, the aspect, in the same dialect. Still there can be little doubt, that there were similar words in the ancient Arabic, because the root is found in this language, and not in the Hebrew. But there is yet a sense of the word *pen*, or *phen*, taken substantively, which I think must have existed in Phœnician. I mean that this word was used to denote a head, a summit, and also a promontory or mountain. Frequently where the word *pen*, variously sounded, *pan*, *phan*, *phen*, *pin*, and *ben*, enters into the composition of names of places, we shall find a mountain, or a promontory, to have been indicated; and this ancient sense of the

word may be discovered in many languages, and in many countries, though it was probably first employed by the Phœnicians. Josephus, speaking of the country where the Jordan rises, says, *Καλεῖται δὲ Πάνιον ὁ τόπος· ἔνθα κορυφὴ μέν τις ὄρους εἰς ἄπειρον ὕψος ἀνατείνεται*—*the place is called Panion; where a certain mountainous summit is uplifted to an immense height.* We are told by Pliny, that Cadmus found gold in a mountain of Thrace called *Pangæus.* (L. 7.) This mountain might have been called פרנאה, *Pen-gah*, i. e. *mons altus*, by Phœnician strangers. Aben Ezra explains פנות, *penuth*, or *penoth*, the plural of פן *pen*, by גבעות, *gibaoth*, *colles.* (Bochart, p. 753.) The Greeks gave the name of Panormus to several different cities; and this name I conceive to be composed of the ancient word *pen*, or *pan*, a mountain, or promontory, and the Greek word ὅρμος, *hormos*, a naval station added to it. The situation of the Sicilian Panormus is known to every one, and its small but beautiful bay, lying between two promontories, well entitled it to its ancient name. Strabo calls the Panormus of Epirus *λιμὴν μέγας, ἐν μέσοις τοῖς Κεραυνίοις*

ὄρεσι—*a great port in the middle of the Ceraunian mountains.* There was a city called *Panionium* in Asia Minor; and this city built on a promontory three stadia above the sea, was supposed by the Greeks to have received its name from the circumstance that *all the Ionians* assembled there to worship Neptune. I should suspect, that the promontory had been originally called *pen*, which the Ionians changed into their own word πᾶν, *pan;* and then called it *Panionion* and explained the name in the manner above stated. (See Herodot. L. 1. c. 147. Mela L. 1. and Strabo p. 639.) Strabo gives the appellation of Phœnicus to the mountain in Lycia, which the Greeks likewise call Olympus. (Strabo L. 14.) But this mountain, which had nothing to do with Phœnicia, was probably originally named *Phen* by the natives. In the isle of Chios, according to Ptolemy, a promontory was known by the name of *Phanaia* (Φαναία ἄκρα). Stephanus derives the name from the Greek; Livy says it was so called from Phanæus a king of Chios; and Virgil speaks to the same purpose. (Liv. L. 36. Virg.

Georg. 2.) But we find other promontories and mountains bearing the same name. There was a city in Syria situate on a mountain called Phanaia, and there remain coins of that city, which represent an eagle on one side, and a mountain on the other. It is to be remarked, that this ancient word *pen*, or *phen*, or *pan*, was often changed into *pend*, or *pent*, or *pand*, or *phand*. Thus in Arabic فند *phand*, signifies a mountain. (See Golius.) The word *pen*, or *pent*, or *pan*, or *phen*, also sounded *ben*, seems to have extended all over Europe. The mountain in Attica called Pentelicus, was probably so named from *pen*, *mons*, and τελικὸς, *extremus*, *summus*. The *Alpes Penninæ* were clearly so named from the word *pen*; and not because the Carthaginians, as Strabo and Pliny thought, had passed over them. (See Livy L. 21. c. 38.) The name of the Apennine mountains may be traced to the same word, which was in general use among the Celts. Many rivers derived their names from *pen*, being denominated from the mountains where they had their sources. But to return to the promontory called *Facies*

Dei, which was probably called Penuel, or Pen-El, by the Phœnicians, I think that they understood by this name *promontorium, vel mons Dei;* as the Israelites probably did in speaking of one of their cities, likewise called Penuel, belonging to the tribe of Reuben.

Tripoli is situate about 34°, 12′, N. L. in a narrow but well-watered valley, on the coast of the Mediterranean; and about 11 geographical miles to the north of Byblus. The Greeks gave to this city the name of Τρίπολις, *Tripolis*. There is a city in Phœnice, says Diodorus Siculus, which is called Tripolis, and which merits the name, that appellation being conformable to its nature; for there are three distinct cities in it, distant about a stadium from each other, one of which is called the city of the Aradians, another of the Sidonians, and a third of the Tyrians. (L. 16.) Strabo, Pliny, and Stephanus Byzantius speak to the same purpose. (Strabo L. 16. Plin. L. 5. Steph. in voce.) The original name was therefore probably השלוש ערים, *Ha Shalosh Arim*, or השלוש, קרתאות, *Ha Shalosh Karetaoth*, The Three Cities; or in Arabic ثلاثة قريات ال *Al Salasah Kariath*.

The cities of Arca, Orthosia, and Symira, lay between Tripoli and the river Eleutherus, (probably called *Khalas*, or *Chaluts*, by the Phœnicians) and consequently, according to Ptolemy, were included in the Phœnician territory. The Greeks have probably corrupted these names, and I am doubtful of their etymology.

The island of Arad belonged to the Phœnicians. Strabo places it at the distance of 20 stadia from the continent—Pliny at 200 paces. This island is only 7 stadia in circumference. It was however covered with houses, and the town appears to have been very populous for its size. (Pomp. Mela L. 2. c. 7.) Strabo describes Arad as a rock rising in the midst of waves; and modern travellers say that it is steep on every side. The name probably comes from the old Persian word ارد *ard*, of which I have had frequent occasion to speak in the first volume of this work. It certainly is applicable to the island of Arad, a high rock which rises abruptly out of the sea, and which is denominated by Strabo πέτρα περίκλυστος.

I have now mentioned the principal cities which were situate on the coast of Phœnice, and which were generally built in narrow valleys, watered by the rivers which descend from the mountains. The Phœnicians had indeed no towns of any consequence at a distance from the sea, except Akkar, and Baalbeck, or rather Baalbeth, called Heliopolis by the Greeks. Some writers however place this last city in Cœlesyria.

Phœnice was bounded on the east by those chains of mountains, which belong to Libanus and Antilibanus. The name in Hebrew, and probably in Phœnician, was לבנון *Lebanon.* According to some, Mount Lebanon was so called from לבנה, *lebonah, thus album,* which is said to grow there in abundance. According to others this mountain received its name as being sacred to the Moon, which luminary was denominated לבנה, *Lebanah,* in the language of the country. I am however rather inclined to derive the name from לבן, *laban, albus.* The lofty summits of Lebanon are covered with perpetual snows; and this mountain may have been

naturally called the white mountain by the first inhabitants of the regions around it.

The streams which water the valleys of Phœnice are many in number, but, with few exceptions, are small in size. The river which joins the sea about two leagues from Tyre, has its source among the mountains near Baalbeck; and the length of its course cannot be estimated at less than 70 or 80 miles. It is remarkable that the ancients have not recorded the name of this river, which the moderns call Casamy, Casamieh, and Casemir. The real name may have been derived from the verb قسم *kasam*, which signifies to divide, as in fact the territory of the Tyrians was separated by the Casamieh, (as I believe it is most generally called,) from the possessions of their Sidonian neighbours on the north. It was on the beach between the mouth of this river and Tyre that the Phœnicians were accustomed to gather the shells of the fish called the murex, the blood of which was employed in dyeing garments. The manner, in which this beautiful purple was first discovered, is thus related by the mythologists. As the

nymph Tyros, who was beloved by Hercules. was walking on the shore, her dog broke a small shell with his teeth, and his mouth immediately became dyed with so brilliant a colour, that the nymph declared to her lover that unless he could procure for her a robe of the same tint, she would see him no more. Hercules accordingly gathered a number of shells, and having dyed a garment in the blood of the murex, presented it to his mistress, who first was adorned with that splendid purple, which was afterwards reserved for the use of princes and kings.

The small stream which flows by Tsidon is called *El Ouli* by some writers, and *El Nahar Aula* by others, ܐܘܠܢܐ *aulona*, in Syriac, signifies a valley; and اول *aol*, or *aul*, bears the same meaning in Arabic. Perhaps the rivulet in question may have been called by the people of the country the stream of the valley. But Dionysius Periegetes calls this river *Bostrenus*.

———καὶ Σίδονα ἀνθεμόεσσαν,
Ναιομένην χαρίεντος ἐφ' ὕδασι Βοστρηνοῖο.

A mountain torrent falls into the sea nearly

half way between Tsidon and Beryth. This is the Tamyras of Strabo (ὁ *Ταμύρας ποταμὸς*), now called *Nahar el Damur* (نهر الدمور) the river of destruction. On its banks was situated the city of Lions (*Λεόντων πόλις*) according to Strabo; but Pliny seems to have thought that this city, which he calls *Leontos oppidum*, was situate to the north of Beryth. Pliny was probably right; and the town in question may have been situated on the *Nahar el Salib* (نهر السليب), the river of spoliation, a large stream, which joins the sea to the north of Beryth, and which flows through a small valley to the west of the great valley of El Bekah. At the distance of about 10 miles further to the north, the traveller crosses a bridge over the river which the Greeks called the Lycus (ὁ *Λύκος ποταμὸς*), and which is now named *Nahar el Kelb*, the Dog river (نهر الكلب). Pococke says, *opposite to the south end of the bridge is an inscription in an eastern character, which seems to be very ancient.* The same traveller remarked some figures cut in the rock, on the side of the road. One of these figures had a cap, resembling a Phrygian bon-

net. Sir William Gell, on whose accuracy I place much reliance, and to whom I owe much gratitude, (since he is the only person who has lent me any assistance whatever in the composition of this work,) informs me that the inscription is in hieroglyphs; but the reader may consult the extract of the letter which he has addressed to me, and which I have annexed to the present chapter.

Near to Tripoli flows the Nahar Kades, (نهر قدس) holy river, or river of Paradise. The Nahar el Berd, which passes by the supposed site of the ancient Orthosia, is so called from the coldness of its waters. The stream, on the banks of which Simyra, or Sumra, is situated is called *Nahar Akar* (نهر اقر), which signifies the river of the valley. We have already seen that the Phœnician territory on the north was bounded by the river called Eleutheros by the Greeks. Its present Arabic name is *Nahar el Gebar*, or *Jebir*, or *Jebr*—the strong, or great river.

But the most celebrated of the rivers of Phœnice was one of the smallest which watered that

country. I mean the river of Adonis, which the Syrians now call (it would be difficult to say why) the river of Abraham. This stream has its source among the rocks of Lebanon, and joins the sea at Byblos. It was named by the Phœnicians after the son of Cinyras. The beautiful Adonis, say the mythologists, forsook the couch of Venus to pursue the pleasures of the chace among his native mountains. Jealous of his rival, Mars changed himself into a wild boar; and under the form of that savage animal, lacerated the thigh of the youthful hunter. The grief of Venus was excessive; but her sighs and tears could not avert the fate of her unfortunate lover; and she transformed the expiring youth into a white rose. As the weeping goddess fondly caressed the fragrant flower, her hand was wounded by a thorn, and the leaves were dyed to crimson by her blood. All roses before that time had been white; but the flower, that had received its hue from the blood of Venus, soon became the admiration of the world; and the red rose was always afterwards esteemed as the pride of the florist, and as the glory of the

garden. In the mean time the death of the silvan warrior was told by a thousand voices. The air was rent with the cries of the nymphs of the forest; and hill and valley rang with their lamentations, while the echoes of Lebanon still repeated the name of the loved, and the lost, Adonis.

Αἰάζω τὸν Ἄδωνιν. ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις.
Ὤλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις, ἐπαιάζουσιν Ἔρωτες.

I mourn Adonis. The fair Adonis is dead. Dead is the fair Adonis, whom the Loves lament.

An annual festival was established to commemorate the fate of the hunter of Lebanon; and the ceremony was celebrated with all the disorder of real affliction. The women, clothed in mourning dresses, uttered doleful cries as they passed along; beat their breasts; and gave their dishevelled locks to the wind. An image was borne by the crowd; and this image represented a youth who had expired in the flower of his age. Funereal hymns resounded on every side. The season was that in which the Sun, after the autumnal equinox, has descended to

the lower hemisphere, and when the yellow leaves have already withered on the half naked boughs. The face of Nature is then overcast with gloom; each day comes later; each night comes sooner; and the approach of winter is heralded by the storms of Autumn, that blight the gardens, and denude the forests. It is then too that the imagination of man is almost always compelled to compare the march of the year with the progress of life; that youth itself often casts an anxious look towards the future; and that age reflects on what has been, and meditates, or ought to meditate, on what must be. The ancients, less artificial than the moderns, were more impressed with the appearances of nature than we are. They mourned the imaginary death of the Sun, in the not less fictitious death of Adonis. It was remarked by the Phœnicians, that the stream, near which the fabled hunter of Lebanon was slain, became annually of a red colour at the season when the festival was celebrated in his honour; and the people were pleased with the figment, when the mythologists feigned, that the

river had received its crimson tint, not from the red earth washed down from the hills by the autumnal rains, but from the blood, which yearly flowed from the wound of the lamented Adonis. The season was felt by the children of Nature to be congenial with sorrow; and they were pleased with a fiction, which fed and indulged, for the moment, the grief that they desired should be only transient. Thus the Phœnicians, during the lapse of many ages, continued to mourn at a certain season of the year the death of Adonis: nor was Adonis any other than a personification of the Sun, and the same with Thammuz,

> Whose annual wound in Lebanon allured
> The Syrian damsels to lament his fate
> In amorous ditties all a summer's day;
> While smooth Adonis from his native rock
> Ran purple to the sea.

Extract of a letter from Sir William Gell to the Rt. Hon. Sir W. Drummond.

"The Persian characters and Hieroglyphic shield yet remaining on the rocks near the Nahr el Kelb were observed by Mr. Wyse, who first seems to have discovered that the shield was the same as that of the obelisks at Luxor. This shield had been taken by Dr. Young for that of Amasis, but it struck me that it was more probably sculptured by Sesostris as a memorial of his conquest of Syria. Having communicated my ideas to Dr. Young in the year 1821, and accounted for the Persian or *cuneiform* characters by the ambition of Cambyses to outshine the glory of the greatest of Egyptian conquerors, the Dr. seemed to acquiesce with me, but expressed some doubts as to the existence of the sculptures.—On referring to Messrs. Bankes and Grey it was found that neither of them had observed the Egyptian shield; but Mr. Godfrey had seen it, and remarked that it contained the same figures as one upon the obelisks at Luxor.

"Mr. Baillie also saw the spot, and either he or Mr. Grey gave me a rough sketch of the rock, No. 1.—No. 2. is from Mr. Wyse's sketch of the shield. M. Champollion seems to have now determined with tolerable certainty that it contains some of the titles of Sesostris or Rameses the great. Dr. Young observed in a letter to me, written in the year 1821, that it was not impossible that the Persian characters might probably at length receive some elucidation from these hieroglyphics, and M. Champollion has in fact made the first satisfactory step from hieroglyphics in the instance of Xerxes. I have endeavoured, hitherto in vain, to procure through Dr. Watson's correspondent in Syria an accurate copy of these interesting monuments, but the perishable nature of the rock on which they are sculptured seems to preclude the hope I had once entertained of a very satisfactory result. I believe the Persian characters exist upon the square tablet under the basso relievo represented in No. 1. There can be little doubt that the figure, No. 3, is Persian. I send the impression of the only Persian sculpture I possess to prove

1

3

2

4

Rock found with Persian and Hieroglyphic Characters

Neale & Stockleys Lithography 362 Strand.

the general resemblance. It is on a signet found on the plain of Marathon, where so many of the Persians fell, and exactly resembles those found at Persepolis.

"I send you a little outline of the mouth of the Lycus, because, without it, it is not easily understood how many travellers should have passed the spot, and a few only have observed the sculptures. Mr. Wyse passed by the most ancient road, which shortened the distance, by cutting through the neck of the promontory, and found, if I mistake not, five different memorials of the Persian conqueror. Maundrell may have observed both roads; but, in general, travellers seem to have preferred the Roman road cut by Antoninus, precipices above the sea, and where on a step is yet observable an inscription with the name of that Emperor. On that road is also a pedestal which the natives think once supported the statue of a dog. Probably it was a statue of the Emperor himself. It might yet be found in the sea below. Dr. Watson crossed at the dotted line below the bridge, not being aware of the ancient road nor its sculptures. The river

was then from 60 to 80 yards wide, and scarcely to be forded on horseback. Mr. Grey and his friend Don Tommaso a Cushi, a native of Mousul, resided for a short time at the monastery of Dar or Deir Ouassy on the right bank of the river."

CHAPTER IV.

Of the fragment of Sanchoniatho.

THE fragment of Sanchoniatho, translated out of Phœnician into Greek by Philo Byblius, and preserved by Eusebius, cannot be passed over in silence by a writer who treats of the origin and ancient history of the Phœnicians. How far the Greek may vary from the original—how often Philo may have interwoven his own sentiments with those of Sanchoniatho—and how frequently and unwarrantably Eusebius may have altered and interpolated the version of Philo—are questions which must always be embarrassing to the philologist and the antiquary. There may be indeed reason to suspect, that the Phœnician author, who flourished before the Trojan war, and probably about the time when

Gideon was judge over Israel, stated the different accounts and traditions, which existed at the æra when he lived, both among his own countrymen, and among neighbouring nations, concerning the origin of the world, and concerning the origin of society; and that the Greek translator, either from misunderstanding the meaning of his author, or for the sake of conciseness, has compressed all these different accounts into one succinct and continued narrative. There seems to me to be no other way of accounting for the inconsistencies and repetitions with which this short fragment abounds. Neither is it easy to understand otherwise, how the same inventions should be attributed to different persons; or how the same persons should appear on the scene at different epochs. In addition to these embarrassments, we are perplexed with the interpolations of Philo and Eusebius. They introduce the names of the Grecian deities, Zeus, Athena, Aphrodite, Hephaistos, of whom it is more than probable that Sanchoniatho had never heard. They even make him speak of the inhabitants of Alexandria, which city was

not founded until a thousand years after his death.

There already exists, if I mistake not, an English translation of this fragment by Bishop Cumberland; but I have been unable to procure a copy of it; and I am therefore compelled to request the reader's indulgence in favour of my own. In the notes which I propose to subjoin to my version, I shall endeavour to throw as much light as I am able on the Phœnician fragment. I have only to add that I shall translate from the Greek text as faithfully and as literally as I can. If we can judge indeed from the Greek copy, we may easily believe the style of the Phœnician original to have been sufficiently obscure; nor can I hope to render the English version free from the same defect.

Sanchoniatho supposes black and windy air to have been the principle of all things; (1) *or the dark blast of wind, and turbid chaos, resembling Erebus.* (2) *But these are infinite, and have no limit through many ages. When, however, says he,*

spirit (3) *became enamoured of its own principles, and commixtion happened, then that connexion was called desire, which was the beginning of the creation of all things.* (4) *But spirit knew not its own creation; and out of the connexion of spirit itself* (5) *Mot* (6) *was begotten. Some say that this* (*Mot*) *is slime; others that it is putrefaction of a watery mixtion; and out of this were produced every seed of procreation, and the generation of all things.* (7) *But there were certain animals not possessing sense, out of which were generated intelligent animals;* (8) *and these were called Zophasemin,* (9) *that is, contemplators of heaven; and were formed in the shape of an egg.* (10) *Then Mot shone forth, and the Sun and Moon, and the stars, and the great stars.*

Such is their cosmogony, which openly leads to atheism. (11) *Let us see next, how Sanchoniatho says the zoogony is to be supported. He states then, that the air being translucent, winds, and clouds, and the greatest falls and effusions of the celestial waters, were produced through combustion both of the sea and of the land. Afterwards all things were divided and separated, each from its proper place, through the heat of the Sun, and*

were sustained, some with others, in the air; but contending together thunders and lightnings were produced; and by the noise of the thunders, the before-mentioned intelligent animals were awakened, affrighted by the sound; and male and female moved on the land and in the sea. ([12]) *Such is their zoogony. The same author afterwards says, that he discovered these things in the Cosmogony written by Taautos,* ([13]) *and in his memoirs, the sense of which he perceived, and found, and brought to light for us out of signs and symbols;* ([14]) *from which he also tells us the names of the Winds; mentioning Notos, and Boreas,* ([15]) *and the rest.*

But those first (intelligent animals) consecrated the fruits of the earth, esteemed them as Gods, and worshipped them; and those who were intermediate, as well as all their predecessors and successors, made libations and sacrifices. He adds that these notions of worship were suitable to their imbecility and timidity of soul.

He says, afterwards Aion and Protogonos, mortals so called, ([16]) *were born to the Wind Kolpias and his wife Baau, which signifies night. Aion found nourishment from the trees. From these*

sprang Genos ([17]) *and Genea who inhabited Phœnice.* ([18]) *There being a drought, they extended their hands to heaven towards the sun. For, he observes that they considered the Sun as God, sole lord of heaven, calling him Beelsamen,* ([19]) *which is lord of heaven among the Phœnicians, and Zeus among the Greeks.* [*He then accuses the Greeks of error; for, says he, we have not variously distinguished these things in vain, but still according to acceptations of names, in regard to things of which the Greeks being ignorant received them otherwise, erring through the ambiguity of the translation.*] ([20])

He then proceeds to state that from Genos, Aion, and Protogonos, mortal sons were afterwards born, whose names were Phos, and Pur, and Phlox, ([21]) *who from the friction of pieces of wood found fire, and taught the use of it. These begot sons excelling in size and stature, who imposed their names on the mountains of which they were the possessors. Thus Cassius, Libanon, Anti-Libanon, and Brathu,* ([22]) *were called after them. From these sprang* ([23]) *Memroumos, who was Hypsouranios. It is said that they were thus named by their mothers, women*

who shamelessly mixed in promiscuous commerce with all whom they met.

Hypsouranios, as he afterwards mentions, inhabited Tyre, and invented sheds (or cabins) of reeds, rushes, and papyri. Seditions were stirred up by his brother Ousoos, (24) who first found a covering for the body in the skins of the wild beasts which he had caught. There happening to be violent rains and winds, the trees in Tyre took fire from the friction, and the wood was burnt; but Ousoos having taken a tree, and having cut off the branches, first ventured to go on the sea. He dedicated two columns to fire and wind, and worshipped them, making libations to them on these columns of the blood of the wild beasts which he had hunted. But these (namely Hypsouranios and Ousoos) having terminated their lives, their successors consecrated branches and columns to them, and offered worship to them at festivals which were celebrated in their honour at certain seasons of the year.

A long time after the generation of Hypsouranios, the inventors of hunting and fishing, Agreas and Alieas, (25) were born; after whom the people were called hunters and fishers, and from whom

were sprung two brothers, who discovered iron and the manner of working it. One of these two, called Chrysor, ([26]) *was skilled in eloquence, and composed verses and prophecies. He was the same with Hephaistos; and invented fishing-hooks, bait, (for taking fish,) cordage, and rafts; and was the first of all mankind who had navigated.* ([27]) *He was therefore worshipped as a God after his death, and was called Diamichios.* ([28]) *It is said that these brothers were the first who contrived partition-walls of brick. Afterwards two youths sprang out of this generation, one of whom was called Technites,* ([29]) *and the other Geïnos-Autochthon.* ([30]) *They devised the art of mixing straw with brick-clay, afterwards drying the bricks in the sun. They also invented roofs. After these, others were born, one of whom was called Agros, and another Agroueros or Agrotes.* ([31]) *Of this last there was an image much venerated, and a shrine borne on a yoke, in Phœnice; and he is named supereminently in the books the greatest of the Gods. These persons invented courts to be placed before houses, and circular galleries, and chambers.* ([32])

From this race sprang another of husbandmen

and hunters, who were called Aletai and Titans. (33) *These begot Amynos and Magos,* (34) *who instituted villages and sheep-folds. After them were born Misor and Suduk;* (35) *(which names signify Dissolute and Just.) They discovered the use of salt. Misor was succeeded by Taautos,* [*who invented alphabetical writing; and was the same whom the Egyptians call Thooth, the Alexandrians Thouth, and the Greek Hermes.*] (36) *From Suduk came the Dioskouroi, or Kabeiroi, or Korubantes, or Samothracians.* (37) *These, he says, were the first who invented a ship.* (38) *Their posterity discovered the cure of the bites of venomous animals by means of herbs and incantations. Among these people were born a certain Elion,* (39) *called Hypsistos,* (40) *and a female named Berouth,* (41) *who dwelt near Byblos. From them sprang Epigeios or Autocthon, who was afterwards called Ouranos* (42) *Thus from him the element above us is named Ouranos (heaven) on account of the excellence of its beauty. But there was born to him of those before mentioned a sister who was called Ge; and on account of her beauty they say the earth received the same name.*

Their father Hypsistos, having been killed in a conflict with the wild beasts, (43) *was consecrated; and his descendants offered sacrifices and libations to him. But Ouranos having succeeded to his father's government, married his sister Ge, and begot sons by her, namely, Ilos (the same as Kronos)* (44) *and Betulos,* (45) *and Dagon,* (46) *(who is Siton,) and Atlas.* (47) *He had also much progeny by other marriages. Ge was much irritated on this account, and being provoked by jealousy, inveighed against Ouranos so much as to cause their separation from each other. But Ouranos having been divorced from her, (though whenever he wished remaining and cohabiting with her by force,) drove her away. He also endeavoured to kill the sons whom he had had by her. Ge, however, having collected her allies, frequently repulsed him.*

Kronos having arrived at manhood employed Hermes Trismegistus, who was his scribe, as his counsellor and assistant; (48) *and avenging the cause of his mother assailed his father Ouranos. The daughters begotten by Kronos were Persephone and Athena.* (49) *Of these the former died a virgin. But Kronos, by the advice of Athena and Hermes,*

fabricated a scythe and a spear of iron. Then Hermes, having spoken magical words to the allies of Kronos, inspired them with the desire of engaging in battle with Ouranos, in favour of Ge; and thus Kronos making war with Ouranos, obtained the government, and succeeded to the kingdom.

The favourite concubine of Ouranos was taken in the battle, and she being then pregnant, Kronos gave her in marriage to Dagon. When she was with him she brought forth the child which she bore in her womb to Ouranos, and he was called Demarous. (50)

After these events Kronos surrounded the place of his habitation with a wall, and founded the first city, Byblos (51) *in Phœnice; and soon afterwards being suspicious of his brother Atlas, he threw him, by the advice of Hermes, into a deep cavern of the earth, where he confined him.*

About this time the descendants of the Dioskouroi having constructed rafts and ships, made voyages; and being cast ashore near Mount Cassius, consecrated a temple there.

The allies of Ilos, or Kronos, were surnamed Elocim, (52) *as also Kronioi, and were so called*

after Kronos. But Kronos having a son called Sadidos (53) *killed him with his own sword, and having confined him from suspicion, he became the murderer of the youth, and deprived him of life. In like manner he cut off the head of his own daughter, so that all the Gods were terrified at the mind (or temper) of Kronos.*

Some time having elapsed, Ouranos, who happened to be still in exile, sent secretly his daughter Astarte, a virgin, with her two sisters, Rhea (54) *and Dione,* (55) *to kill Kronos by fraud; but he seduced the young women, who were fit for marriage, and espoused his sisters. Ouranos, as soon as he was informed of this, marched with Heimarmene and Hora,* (56) *and other allies, against Kronos, who however conciliated them, and gained them over to himself.*

Afterwards, says he, the God Ouranos invented Bætylia, fabricating animated stones. (57)

Astarte bore seven daughters, Titanides or Artemides, to Kronos; and Rhea moreover bore to him seven sons, of whom the youngest was consecrated at his birth. Females were produced by Dione; and again of Astarte two males were born, namely,

Desire and Love. But Dagon, after he had discovered (the sowing of) corn, and the (use of the) plough, was called the agricultural Jupiter. ([58]) *One of the Titanides having had commerce with Suduk,* ([59]) *surnamed the Just, brought forth* ([60]) *Asklepios. There were also begotten by Kronos, in a land beyond the seas, three sons who had the same name as their father, namely, Jupiter, Belus, and Apollo.* ([61]) *Then were born Pontos, and Typhon, and Nereus, who was the father of Pontos. But Pontos begot Sidon, (who by the excellence of a sweet voice first invented the melody of song,) and Neptune,* ([63]) *Melkarthus,* ([64]) *the same as Hercules, was begotten by Demarous. Afterwards Ouranos made war with Pontus, and flying joined himself to Demarous, who attacked Pontus; but was repulsed by him, and vowed a sacrifice for a safe escape.*

Moreover, in the thirty-second year of his reign and government, Ilos (who is Kronos), laying snares for his father Ouranos in a certain mediterranean place, and overpowering him, cut off his genitals, near some fountains and rivers. Here Ouranos was consecrated; and his spirit was freed, and the

blood from his genitals flowed into the waters of the fountains and rivers. The place is still shown. [*Such were the acts of Kronos, and such the things to be venerated in those who flourished during his life so much celebrated by the Greeks, and whom they proclaim as the first and golden race of men, who articulated a distinct language, that blessed happiness of the ancients.*] (65)

The same author, after reporting other things, proceeds to state, that Astarte, (66) *surnamed the greatest, Jupiter Demarous, and Adodos,* (67) *reigned over the regions with the consent of Kronos. But Astarte placed on her own head the head of a bull as the symbol of royalty.* (68) *Having made the circuit of the world, she found an eagle fallen from the air, and which being killed in the sacred isle of Tyre, she consecrated it.* (69) [*The Phœnicians say that Astarte is the same as Aphrodite; and that Kronos going through the world gave the kingdom of Attica to his daughter Athena.*] (70) *There being a plague and lues, Kronos sacrificed his only begotten son to his father Ouranos. He likewise cut off his own genitals, and compelled his allies who were with him to do the same thing.*

Not long after, he consecrated another of his sons, who had died, and whom he had had by Rhea. His name was Mouth, (71) *[whom the Phœnicians call Death and Pluto.] Kronos afterwards gave the city of Byblos to the Goddess Baaltis, [who is the same with Dione.]* (72) *He likewise gave Berytos to Poseidon and the Kaberoi, husbandmen and fishermen; and they consecrated the remains of Pontus in Berytos.*

Before these events the God Taautos having made a picture of Ouranos, and portraits of Kronos and Dagon, and the rest of the Gods, delineated the sacred characters of the (alphabetical) elements. (73) *But he devised for Kronos a symbol of royalty; four eyes; two eyes in front and two behind; and two were quietly closed. And on his shoulders four wings; two expanded for flying, and two at rest. The symbol of the eyes signifies that while Kronos sleeps he sees, and while he watches he sleeps. The wings in a similar manner denote, that when quiescent he flies, and flies when quiescent.*

The other Gods have each two wings on their shoulders, that they may fly together with Kronos, who has also two wings on his head; one indica-

ting government over the mind, and the other over sense.

When Kronos came into the south country, he gave all Egypt to the God Taautos. Thus the kingdom became his.

Sanchoniatho says, that first of all, the seven sons of Sudek, [4], the Kabeiroi, and their eighth brother Asklepios, recorded these things, as the God Taautos had ordered them; but that the son of Thabion, the first hierophant of the Phœnicians sprung from Aion, allegorized them, and having mixed them with mundane and physical affections, delivered them over to those who celebrated the orgies, and to the prophets with whom the mysteries originated; and they [endeavouring to augment this smoke in every way,] transmitted it to their successors, and to those who were afterwards initiated; one of whom was Isiris, [5], inventor of the three letters, [6], and brother of Chna, the first who took the surname of Phoinix. [7]

The same author adds what follows—[But the Greeks, who excel all nations in ingenuity, first frequently appropriated these things to themselves, and then thinking to render them agreeable with

the ornaments and charms of fables, strangely exaggerated, and wholly varied them. Hence Hesiod, and the poets who circulate about public places, reciting on every side theogonies, and battles of Giants, and battles of Titans, have formed figments, partly their own, and partly cut out of the productions of others; and carrying about these compositions with them, have vanquished truth. But our ears fed with these figments, and pre-occupied with them for many ages, guard as a deposit the mythic poetry, which, as I stated when I began, has been handed down to us; and being now confirmed by time, it would be very difficult to prohibit its retention. Thus truth seems to be idle stories, and spurious tales to be truth. ([78])]

NOTES.

(1) I CANNOT help thinking that Philo must have mistaken the sense of the original in translating this passage. Sanchoniatho would scarcely have been so much celebrated for his wisdom, had he held some of the opinions which are attributed to him by his Greek interpreter. What writer could have acquired esteem and reputation by teaching, for example, that a dark wind and chaos were the principles of all things?

It is true that the doctrine of materialism appears to have been promulgated at a very remote æra in Phœnice; and according to Posidonius, cited by Strabo (L. 16.) and by Sextus Empiricus (L. 9.), the dogma concerning atoms (τὸ περὶ τῶν ἀτόμων δόγμα) was attributed to Moschus, or Mochus, a Phœnician philosopher, who flourished before the Trojan times. But there is no reason to suppose that Sanchoniatho was even acquainted with the atomic philosophy; and in fact his Greek translator makes him

hold opinions even less consistent with reason than those adopted by the atomists.

But Philo appears to me to have misunderstood his author, who probably held, like the Tsabaists, the eternal existence both of spirit and of matter. The word *ruach*, by which all the nations between the Euphrates and the Nile expressed spirit, also signified breath or wind. The Greek words *pneuma* and *psuche*, (spirit and soul,) originally bore the same sense. We ourselves have borrowed the word spirit from the Latins; and *spiritus* literally signifies breath, or wind, like *ruach* and *pneuma*. The first formers of language were not metaphysicians. They had probably no very clear notions concerning immaterial beings; and when they had to denominate and describe the essence of such beings, they called it a breath, or a wind; and as imagination guided them, represented it either as clothed with light, or as shrouded in darkness.

The Hebrews, Chaldeans, and Phœnicians, appear to have understood the word *ruach*, and that at a very early period, in the same sense as we do the word spirit. The Greeks, on the contrary, never seem to have understood either *pneuma* or *psuche* to be a purely immaterial essence, before they became acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity. What the Pythagoreans and the Platonists held to be immaterial, both in divine and in human nature, they termed *nous*, mind, or intellect. Ideas, in

the Platonic sense of the word, were likewise considered as immaterial. Form, in the language of Aristotle, was also distinct from matter. But the Pagan Greeks represented neither the essence of their deities, nor that of human souls, as purely immaterial, though some of them, according to Plutarch (de placit. Philosoph.), thought the soul to be immortal and incorruptible. But since they considered *pneuma* in a different point of view from what we do, when we speak of a spiritual being, they might have easily misunderstood the Orientalists, who, after the example of the sacred writers, frequently used the word *ruach* as signifying a spirit. The fact is, that, except among physiologists, *pneuma*, and *pneumata*, were generally understood in their literal sense to signify breath, wind, gales, afflations. In the fragment before us Philo appears to have mistaken the sense of his author, by giving a literal translation of the word *ruach*, which was probably employed by Sanchoniatho. The Phœnician author, it seems to me, meant to speak of a spirit. Philo makes him speak of a blast of wind. The words of Sanchoniatho might have been nearly as follows—

הראשות היו רוח וחשך ותהו וערב: *The beginnings were spirit, and darkness, and emptiness, and gloom;* or,

בראשית היתה הרוח חשכה ויהי תהו ויהי ערב. *In the beginning was the dark spirit, and there was emptiness and there was gloom.*

I must leave it to others to judge of this proposed restitution. I subjoin the Greek of Philo—*THN τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεται ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη, ἢ πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους, καὶ χάος θολερὸν, ἐρεβῶδες.*

(2) It is remarkable that all the nations of antiquity appear to have borrowed something in their cosmogonies from the account of the creation which has been recorded by the sacred historian in the book of Genesis. This account might have been handed down from Adam to Noach, and from that Patriarch and his sons to their immediate descendants. After the dispersion of mankind, and the division of nations and languages, the short history of the origin of the world underwent, it may be easily supposed, many alterations; and mythologists probably added much to it in later ages. The only accurate tradition appears to have been preserved by the descendants of Shem in the line of Eber; but however various, or fanciful, may have been the structures built on this tradition, whether by Tsabaists, or by less enlightened idolaters, we always find one part or another which has been copied from the ancient fabric.

1. To begin with the fragment before us, we easily recognise the statement of Sanchoniatho to be nothing else than a perverted version of that made by the sacred historian. In attempting to turn the Greek of Philo's first sentence into Phœnician, I have had occasion to employ

few words, and yet four of those words I have taken from the two first verses of the first chapter of Genesis. The *turbid chaos* of Sanchoniatho was evidently expressed either by the word *tohu*, or *bohu*, or perhaps by both, in the original Phœnician. Again, the *dark and windy air* must have been expressed by the words *chashack* and *ruach*, though the latter word, as I have observed above, ought not to have been taken by Philo in its literal sense. It is difficult to suppose that these coincidences were merely accidental. The sacred historian says; *In principio creavit Deus cœlum et terram. Terra autem erat inanis et vacua, et tenebræ erant super faciem abyssi; et Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas.* The profane historian says; *In principio erant Spiritus tenebrosus et vacuum turbidum* (*vel obscurum*). The sacred writer, in the true principles of theism, tells us that God created the universe. The profane writer, who held matter to have existed eternally as well as mind, tells us that spirit and chaos were together in the beginning. Thus the original tradition preserved by Moses was perverted by Sanchoniatho; but the latter had not the less in view the statement, and even the very words, of the former. We may admit this, without believing on the authority of Porphyry, that the Phœnician historian had been entrusted with the care of the sacred records; since he might have been permitted to read them, during his resi-

dence in the land of Israel. It will indeed be my object in some of the succeeding notes to show that this was actually the case. Some writers, it is true, have contended that if Sanchoniatho had been acquainted with the book of Genesis, he would scarcely have failed to mention the garden of Eden, the deluge, the tower of Babel, &c. But the Phœnician author may not have chosen to adopt the whole, though he may have adopted parts of the history written by Moses. He might have feared to offend his own countrymen, by following implicitly the records of the Hebrews. Besides, it is to be observed that many of the statements of Sanchoniatho may have been omitted by Eusebius.

2. Let us now turn to the Chaldeans. Alexander Polyhistor thus cites Berosus—*Γενέσθαι φησὶ χρόνον ἐν ᾧ τὸ πᾶν σκότος καὶ ὕδωρ εἶναι—He says there was a time in which the universe consisted of darkness and water.* Was not that the time when *darkness was on the face of the deep?* I have already shown in the first volume of this work what the Babylonian historian meant by saying, that Belus had cut *Omoroka* into two parts. The word *Omoroka*, thus mutilated in the translation, appears to have been written in the Chaldaic יום־ורקיע, *im-o-rokia, sea and firmament.* But this division of *omoroka,* or the sea and the firmament from each other, was evidently copied by Berosus from the first chapter of Genesis. The

Babylonian historian adds, that Belus also divided the heavens from the earth, καὶ διατάξαι τὸν κόσμον, *pulchreque disposuit mundum.* The sacred historian says, *Dixit vero Deus: Congregentur aquæ, quæ sub cælo sunt, in locum unum: et appareat arida. Et factum est ita. Et vocavit Deus aridam, terram; congregationes aquarum appellavit maria. Et vidit Deus quod esset bonum.*

3. The books ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus are unquestionably forgeries; but the authors may have been, and probably were, well versed in the branches of Egyptian learning of which they have treated. We find the following passage in the Pimander—*Erat enim umbra infinita in abysso, aqua insuper, et spiritus tenuis intellectualis, per divinam potentiam in chaos inerant.* If the ancient Egyptians taught this doctrine, there can be no doubt whence they took it. Porphyry tells us that the Egyptians said that *Kneph*, the Demiourgos, projected an egg from his mouth, and that they interpreted this egg to signify the world. They therefore clearly meant that the world was produced by the breath, or in other words, by the spirit of God. The doctrine taught in the Pimander is consequently not at variance with that attributed to the Egyptians by Porphyry. *Kneph*, or *Knuphi*, the Demiourgos, the great *opifex verum*, was considered, as we learn from Plutarch, as an unbegotten and immortal being. This then was the intellectual spirit, which produced the world, and

which gave form and order to the shapeless mass. This was the spirit of God which moved on the face of the waters. The reader may also consult the Asclepius, c. 7.

4. Megasthenes, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, affirmed that the Hindus and the Jews were the only people who had a true idea of the creation of the world. I observe, however, that the same Megasthenes, according to Strabo (L. 15.), held a different opinion; and indicates that upon this point the Indians agreed with the Greeks. Thus they thought like the Greeks, concerning the origin and destruction of the world, which they considered to be spherical in form. But Strabo adds from the same author, that according to the sentiment of the Indians, the God regulating and constituting the world, pervaded the whole of it. This doctrine leads to pantheism. We have therefore to choose between the report of Strabo and that of Clemens. I am inclined, I confess, to give credit to the latter. The celebrated passage in the Veda, quoted by Mr. Colebrooke, authorises this conclusion—*The Supreme Being alone existed: afterwards there was universal darkness: next, the watery ocean was produced by the diffusion of virtue: then did the Creator, lord of the universe, rise out of the ocean, and successively frame the sun and moon, &c.* (Asiatic Researches, vol. v. p. 361.) Again, in the institutes of Menu, we read, that *he with a thought created the waters.* A hymn, translated

from the Sanscrit by Mr. Colebrooke, describes a period, when nothing existed save the Deity; *that Being that breathed without afflation. Other than him nothing existed. Darkness there was; for this universe was enveloped with darkness, and was undistinguishable like fluids mixed in water.*

5. *The Persians,* says Shah Cholgi, *have the tradition from Zerdhusht, that the supreme God created the world in six times, or periods.* These six periods (شش گاهان, *shesh gahan,*) are referred by the modern Persians themselves to the six days, (شش روزان, *shesh rozan,*) in which, according to the first chapter of the book of Genesis, the work of creation was commenced and completed. Whether the word יום, *yom,* in that chapter ought to be translated *day,* or *period,* I shall not undertake to decide; at the same time that the adoption of the latter signification is now supported by arguments which were unknown to the Greek and Latin interpreters, as the readers of M. de Luc cannot fail to admit. The Persians likewise held that the Gods of light and darkness, Ormusd and Ahriman, reigned alternately during a period of 12,000 years. Thus 6000 years were allotted to the reign of day, and 6000 to the reign of night. This notion likewise appears to have had its origin in the tradition concerning the six days and nights, which preceded the first sabbath.

6. The Etruscans held opinions upon this subject very similar to those taught by the Persians. According to the Etruscans, as we are informed by Suidas, the Deity employs 12,000 years in creating and perfecting the universe, which is divided into 12 parts. During the first 1000 years the Demiourgos created the heavens and the earth; during the next, the apparent firmament which is called heaven; during the third, the sea and all other waters; during the fourth, the sun, moon, and stars; during the fifth, all birds, reptiles, and quadrupeds, existing in the air, the earth, and the water.

Suidas then proceeds—*Thus the first six thousand years appear to have passed before the formation of man; and the next six thousand were intended for the duration of the human race, in order that the whole period might be completed in* 12,000 *years.* If for the first six periods, each of a thousand years, we read six days, we shall find the account correspond so nearly with that given in the Mosaic account of the creation, as to leave little doubt that the cosmogony of the Etruscans derived its origin from that primæval tradition, which has alone been accurately preserved in the first chapter of Genesis. It is likewise remarkable that many of the Rabbin have had the notion, that the world should only last 6000 years after the creation of man. According to the chronology most commonly received, though perhaps not the most accurately stated or

clearly proved, 5824 years have only elapsed since the creation of Adam.

7. We now come to the cosmogonies of the Greek mythologists. Here we find nothing but materialism. No mention is made of a spiritual being. We hear nothing of a creator; nothing of a spiritual demiourgos. Still, however, we trace these cosmogonies to their sources in Egypt and the East. The earth, says the sacred historian, was inform and void, and darkness was on the face of the deep. This statement is closely copied by the Greeks, who represent Chaos and Night as originally existing together. The desire of producing good, or benevolence, was without doubt the motive of the Deity in creating the world and all that it contains; for still as he proceeded in the mighty work, he saw that it was good. The Greek mythologists recognised the good in the harmony of nature, in the generation, production, and organization of animals; but they did not perceive that it proceeded from benevolence guided by intelligence. They mistook a moral for a material cause; and attributed the regular order of things to a physical principle. This principle they called *eros*, or *love;* regarded it as the source of generation and production; and personified it as the being that holds the whole system of nature in harmony. They followed the most general opinion of the nations of the East concerning the original state of the material uni-

verse; but they appear to have misunderstood that opinion, when they failed to ascribe the form, order, and beauty of the structure, to the wisdom and benevolence of the Divine Architect.

The theogony of Hesiod seems evidently to have been copied from that received among the Phœnicians; with this difference, however, that no mention is made of that Spirit, which in spite of the version of Philo, I contend, was introduced by Sanchoniatho into his account of the origin of the universe. The Greek poet says—

Ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
Ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου
Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῷ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
Ἠδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,
Λυσιμελής, πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων
Δάμναται ἐν στήθεσσι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν.
Ἐκ Χάεος δ' Ἔρεβός τε, μέλαινά τε Νὺξ ἐγένοντο.
Νυκτὸς δ' αὖτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἐξεγένοντο,
Οὓς τέκε κυσσαμένη, Ἐρέβει φιλότητι μιγεῖσα.
Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἶσον ἑαυτῇ
Οὐρανον ἀστερόεντθ', κ. τ. λ.

First Chaos was; and then broad-breasted Earth,
The seat still safe of all the deathless Powers
That on Olympus' snow-clad summit dwell,
Or that inhabit gloomy Tartarus,

In deep recesses of the spacious soil.
Then Love, the fairest of immortal Gods,
Was born. 'Tis he that chases care away,
Subdues the mind, and rules in reason's spite,
O'er every bosom human and divine.
Black Night and Erebus from Chaos sprang;
And then were Day and Æther born of Night,
Who brought them forth to her loved Erebus;
And Earth produced an equal to herself,
The starry Heaven, &c.

Aristophanes, in his comedy of the Birds, has introduced a short account of the origin of the universe, which he had probably borrowed from some ancient mythologist, and which he makes one of his birds repeat—

Χάος ἦν, καὶ Νὺξ, Ἔρεβός τε μέλαν πρῶτον, καὶ Τάρταρος εὐρύς·
Γῆ δ', οὐδ' ἀὴρ, οὐδ' οὐρανὸς ἦν. Ἐρέβους δ' ἐν ἀπείροσι κόλποις
Τίκτει πρώτιστον ὑπηνέμιον Νὺξ ἠ μελανόπτερος ὠὸν,
Ἐξ οὗ περιτελλομέναις ὥραις ἔβλαστεν Ἔρως ὁ ποθεινὸς, κ. τ. λ.

Chaos there was, and Night, black Erebus,
And spacious Tartarus. Nor earth, nor air,
Nor heav'n was yet. Then first in boundless depths
Night, sable-pinioned, bore to Erebus
An egg long sterile, but from which at last,
As time rolled on, the amiable Eros sprang.

In the Argonautics attributed to Orpheus, but supposed

to have been composed by Onomacritus, the poet celebrates,

Ἀρχαίου μὲν πρῶτα Χάους ἀμέγαρτον ἀνάγκην
Καὶ Κρόνον, ὃς ἐλύχευσεν ἀπειρεσίοισιν ὑφ' ὑλκοῖς
Αἰθέρα, καὶ διφυῆ, περιωπέα, κυδρὸν Ἔρωτα,
Νυκτὸς ἀειγνήτης πατέρα κλυτὸν, ὅν ῥα φάνητα
Ὀπλότεροι καλέουσι βροτοὶ, πρῶτος γὰρ ἐφάνθη, κ. τ. λ.

The reign immense of ancient Chaos first;
Then Kronos, that in boundless realms begot
Æther, and two-sexed, brilliant, glorious Love,
Of ever-breeding Night the splendid sire,
Whom later mortals Phanes call, because
He first shone forth, &c.

In all these examples we hear nothing of mind or spirit. Eros is the mighty agent. No allusion is made to final causes, and no hint is given of the existence of a moral being, that changed the dark and dreadful chaos into this bright and beautiful universe.

We might indeed almost think that the Greek mythologists had heard the Mosaic account of the creation repeated with the omission of the name of God. According to the sacred historian, the earth, as it was originally created, was void and inform. According to Hesiod, chaos was first, and afterwards the earth. Darkness, says the historian, was on the face of the deep. Night and Erebus, says the poet, sprang from Chaos. The spirit of

God, continues the sacred writer, moved on the face of the waters, and God said, Let light be, and light was. Thus light had been preceded by darkness; and the profane writer represents Day as the offspring of Erebus and Night. The firmament, or expanse, was next formed by the Creator, according to Moses; and according to Hesiod, Ge, or Earth, existed before Ouranos, or Heaven.

In the passage quoted from Aristophanes, Chaos is represented as originally existing with Night, Erebus, and Tartarus. Night at length brought forth an egg to Erebus. This egg the poet calls ὑπηνέμιον, literally *subventaneum* or *subventosum*; but which here means empty, or sterile. It was however fecundated in the course of time; and Eros sprang from it. The universe was symbolized by the egg; and Eros was considered as the material demiourgos. The fable was borrowed, though imperfectly, from the Egyptian mythology. The Egyptians, as we have already seen, represented the egg as proceeding from the mouth of *Kneph*, or *Knuphi*; and by this type they symbolized the universe as produced by the Spirit, or the Word, of God. But they also frequently exhibited a hieroglyph, in which a serpent was seen issuing from the mystic egg. The serpent was the type of the *Agathodæmon*, or of *Knuphi*, when he took the name of *Phthah*, and assumed the character of demi-

ourgos. Consequently the hieroglyph represented the Good Genius that created the universe, reproducing himself in his work, and reappearing in the form of the preserver of that world which he had made. But the Greek mythologists were materialists; and they comprehended nothing of this sublime mystery. They seem to have divided the labours of Phthah, the *opifex mundi*, between Eros and Hephaistos, or Cupid and Vulcan. Thus they changed the Good Genius into a blind and sensual deity; and degraded the great Architect of the universe into a buffoon and a blacksmith.

8. Let us now turn our attention to the notions which were entertained by the early philosophers of Greece concerning the origin of the universe. Of these philosophers, however, I shall only mention Pherecydes, Pythagoras, and Thales, because they had visited Egypt, Phœnice, and Chaldea, before those countries had submitted to the Persian yoke. It is indeed only before that important æra that we can look for the genuine learning and religious opinions of the priests of Memphis, Tyre, and Babylon. The arts soon ceased to flourish, and the lamp of knowledge was soon extinguished, under the thraldom of barbarians who made war against the sciences, after having conquered the nations that had cultivated them.

The history of Pherecydes is imperfectly known. He was a native of the isle of Syros, and was the master of

Pythagoras. He appears to have resided for some time in Phœnice, and afterwards in Egypt; and whatever philosophical knowledge he possessed was probably obtained in those countries. The notices which remain to us of his opinions concerning the origin of the world are few and indistinct. Diogenes Laertius (L. 1.) makes him say—Ζεὺς μὲν καὶ χρόνος εἶς ἀεὶ, καὶ χθὼν ἦν. Χθονίῃ δὲ ὄνομα ἐγένετο Γῆ, ἐπειδὴ αὐτῇ Ζεὺς γέρας διδοῖ—*Jupiter and time were always one, and there was soil; but the name of the soil was earth, after Jupiter gave it honour.* The meaning of this sentence is, that God and time and terrestrial matter always existed; but that after God had given form and beauty to the terrestrial matter, it received the name of earth. It may consequently be inferred from this passage that Pherecydes held the eternal existence both of mind and of matter.

Pythagoras, while he acknowledged Jupiter to be the framer and father of the universe, appears to have admitted the eternity of matter as a principle. Hierocles says,—Τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς ἔθος ἦν τοῖς Πυθαγορείοις τῷ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Ζηνὸς ὀνόματι σεμνύνειν—*it was the custom among the Pythagoreans to reverence the framer and father of the universe under the name of Zeus and Zen.* But we find the following passage in Plutarch (de placit. Philosophor.) Πάλιν δὲ τὴν μονάδα καὶ τὴν ἀόριστον δυάδα ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς· σπεύδει δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν ἀρχῶν ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ ποιητικὸν αἴτιον καὶ εἰδικὸν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ νοῦς, ὁ θεὸς, ἡ δὲ

ἐπὶ τὸ παθητικόν τε καὶ ὑλικὸν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ ὁρατὸς κόσμος—*Again* (*Pythagoras reckons*) *the monad and the infinitive duad among principles. But of his principles the one tends towards the active and formative cause, which is mind, or God; the other towards the passive and material, which is the visible world.* The same writer makes the following statement in another chapter—Πυθαγόρας τῶν ἀρχῶν τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεὸν, καὶ τἀγαθὸν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς φύσις, αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς· τὴν δ' ἀόριστον δυάδα, δαίμονα καὶ τὸ κακὸν, περὶ ἣν ἐστι τὸ ὑλικὸν πλῆθος· ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ὁρατὸς ὁ κόσμος—*Of the principles Pythagoras calls the monad God and the good, which is the nature of the unit, itself the mind; but the infinite duad he calls the dæmon and evil, around which is the material plenitude; and this is the visible world.* Stobæus gives the passage nearly in the same words; but writes τοῦ νοὸς φύσις, *nature of the mind,* for τοῦ ἑνὸς φύσις, *nature of the one.* Now from these extracts it appears, that Pythagoras taught the eternal existence of mind and matter; and not only of these, but of the two principles of good and evil. It is true that, according to a passage in Diogenes Laertius, Pythagoras held ἀρχὴν μὲν τῶν ἁπάντων μονάδα· ἐκ δὲ τῆς μονάδος ἀόριστον δυάδα, ὡς ἂν ὕλην, τῇ μονάδι αἰτίῳ ὄντι ὑποστῆναι—*the monad to be the principle of all things; but that out of the monad proceeds the infinite duad, quasi matter, subjected to the monad, its*

author. This doctrine is certainly preferable to that ascribed to Pythagoras by Plutarch; but still it is not pure theism, since it seems to be clearly implied by these words that the duad, or matter, was necessarily produced by the monad. The theist holds the creation of the material universe to have been the voluntary act of the deity. Besides, since the duad is called infinite, it must also be called eternal. Eternity cannot be separated from infinity.

Thales, as we learn from Diogenes Laertius, was of Phœnician origin; and consequently his opinion concerning the origin of the world was probably drawn from the same sources as that of Sanchoniatho himself. Plutarch (de placit. Philosoph.) says, Θαλῆς ὁ Μιλήσιος ἀρχὴν τῶν ὄντων ἀπεφήνατο τὸ ὕδωρ—*Thales, the Milesian, showed water to have been the principle of beings.* But Plutarch ought to have attended to the words of Cicero, who had explained before him the doctrine of Thales. This philosopher, according to Cicero, did say that water was the beginning of all things; but he evidently spoke of things material, because he held God to be that mind, which formed all things out of water :—*Deum autem, eam mentem, quæ ex aqua cuncta fingeret.* (De Nat. Deor. L. 1.) Laertius, however, errs not less than Plutarch concerning the doctrine of Thales, when he tells us, that, according to that philosopher, *God is the eldest of beings, because he is*

unbegotten—πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων, θεός· ἀγέννητον γάρ: and adds, κάλλιστον, κόσμος· ποίημα γὰρ θεοῦ—*the world is the most beautiful, because it is God's making.* (L. 1.) Laertius himself admits, that Thales gave the epithet of ἔμψυχος, *animated*, to the world, and said that it was full of dæmons; and Stobæus has explained the doctrine of the Milesian philosopher more fully, when he informs us that Thales considered God as the mind of the world, and taught that the divine power pervades and moves the elementary moisture—νοῦν τοῦ κόσμου τὸν θεὸν—διήκειν δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ στοιχειώδους ὑγροῦ δύναμιν θείαν κινητικὴν αὐτόν. The nature of the deity supposes immutability. As God exists now, he has existed always. If his essence now permeate the material universe, it has done so from eternity. To hold that the divine essence pervades the universe, in the sense in which this doctrine was understood by the ancients, is to admit at once the doctrine of pantheism; and to consider the Deity as the mind of the world, is to acknowledge the eternal existence of matter as well as of spirit, and of the universe as well as of God. Consequently, if the Milesian philosopher reasoned consistently, he must have held the material to have been co-eternal with the spiritual principle.

Thus it appears, that though the early philosophers of Greece, (and I might perhaps add those who were more recent,) acknowledged that the Deity had built up the fair

structure of the world, they yet believed that the materials were always co-existent with the divine Architect who employed them. They admitted that mind had framed and adorned the external universe; but they perceived not the God that had created it out of nothing.

(3) Τὸ πνεῦμα. Whether Philo understood this word as signifying wind, or spirit, the original word, it is pretty clear, must have been רוח (*ruach*), and I therefore prefer the latter interpretation.

(4) The meaning of this sentence is not a little obscure. Spirit is said to have become enamoured of its own principles. What are the principles of spirit? The connexion of spirit with its principles, we are told, was called Desire, or Love; and to this is attributed the beginning of the creation of all things. It is pretty plain, either that Sanchoniatho did not know his own meaning, or that that meaning has been misunderstood by Philo.

(5) Here we are told that spirit knew not what it had procreated, but that out of its connexion with itself *Mot* was begotten. Thus spirit created, or procreated, something, it knew not what, out of its connexion with itself, though we had been told a moment before, that the connexion of spirit with its principles was the beginning of the creation, or procreation, of all things.

(6) Bochart derives *mot* from מוד, *mod*, which he supposes to have been an Oriental word, and to which he

traces the Arabic מאדה, *madah*, matter. But the Arabic word is written مادة, *madat*, or *maddat*; and Sanchoniatho may have also written מאדת, which the Greek interpreter altered into *mot*. I observe, however, that in Egyptian the word *mot* signifies *crassitudo*. The English word *mud* is thought by some to have been originally the same with that which Bochart supposes to have been Phœnician. It bears the same sense as *mot*.

(7) But in what, it may be asked, does this *mot* differ from the turbid chaos, which existed in the beginning? Spirit and chaos existed together. Spirit became enamoured of its own principles, and from its connexion with itself begot *Mot*; and *Mot* is slime, or the putrefaction of a watery mixtion; in other words, *Mot* is chaos. Was the original author guilty of all the inconsistencies, which I have already remarked at the very commencement of his work, or did the Greek interpreter misunderstand, and consequently misrepresent his meaning? I can have little doubt that the blame is to be imputed to Philo.

(8) This doctrine may be thus expressed. There first existed matter in the form of slime, or of putrefaction of a watery mixtion, called *mot*. In this matter organization began, and animals were generated. These animals were void of sense; but as new organizations went on, the animals generated in slime became more perfect, and generated other animals still more perfectly organized than them-

selves, until rational and intelligent beings were produced. It is certainly a remarkable fact, that almost all the most ancient Greek philosophers traced the origin of the material world to water, or to a watery mixtion. Plato (in Theæteto) ascribes this notion to various philosophers whom he names, and seems indeed only to except Parmenides. Aristotle (Metaphysic. L. 1.) speaks nearly to the same purpose. Both of these celebrated writers allude to the verse in Homer (Iliad Ξ. v. 201)—

Ὠκεανόν τε Θεῶν γένεσιν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν.

Ocean generator, and Tethys mother of the Gods;

and Aristotle adds that the oath of the Gods was by the water, which the poets call Styx; because that which is most ancient is most honoured, and the oath was held in the highest reverence. But this doctrine had probably its origin in Egypt; and was afterwards adopted by the Phœnicians and the Greeks. The mythologists, however, who thus held water to be the primary principle of all things, probably fell into this error without examining the question, and trusted to the opinions of others. The same excuse can hardly be offered for those, who pretended to prove from the phænomena of the universe, that all existence was to be referred to a material principle and to natural causes. Cicero thus mentions Strato—*nec audiendus Strato, qui physicus appellatur, qui omnem vim divinam in natura sitam esse censet, quæ causas gignendi,*

augendi, minuendive habeat, sed careat omni sensu. (De Nat. Deor. L. 1.) Anaximander said that the infinite was the principle of all things; Anaximenes seemed to consider the infinite to be aërial; and Archelaus appears to have adopted the same opinion; while Anaxagoras accounted for all existence by the union of similar parts. It is justly objected to the first of these philosophers by Plutarch, (and the same objection might have been addressed to them all,) that his principle, vaguely as he defines it, is still a material principle, and matter cannot possess power or energy, unless an active cause be supposed. (de placit. Philosoph.) With regard to the primary source of generation, Archelaus probably expressed the prevailing opinion of the philosophers of his time, when he held men and animals to have been originally generated by heat acting upon a slimy matter produced by the earth. (Diog. Laert. L. 2.) Nor in more recent times has this doctrine been without its advocates, who have endeavoured to support it by such reasoning as the following.

All our conclusions, say they, concerning the origin and generation of animals ought to be founded on observation and experience. The mud of the Nile teems with living creatures fostered into existence by the powerful influence of the solar rays. Even in northern regions the summer sun no sooner returns to thaw the soil, than swarms of insects issue from the bosom of the earth; myriads of

reptiles people the fens and marshes; and the surface of every stagnant pool is quick with life. But these are not the only instances of the generative powers of nature. Innumerable *animalcula* exist in the food which we eat, in the water which we drink, in the very air which we breathe. Generation, birth, growth, decay, and dissolution, are still to be attributed to natural causes. The animal only lives while it receives nutriment, and nutriment is effected by the assimilation of the particles of food to the body into which it enters. Physiologists have proved, that not an atom of matter which existed in the child remains in the man. Are not these sufficient proofs of the generative power of Nature—of her power to produce and to re-produce—to unite and to re-unite? It is Nature that composes and decomposes all bodies, whether organized or unorganized. Now what is it that we call nature but a *vis materialis?* If therefore this *vis materialis* be sufficient to generate and organize the reptile that crawls in the mud of the Nile, might not the same *vis materialis,* exerted in a greater degree, and acting upon the proper elements, have been sufficient to generate and organize, not only the beast of the field, and the bird of the air, but man himself? Nature performs her operations according to laws, which are dictated to her by physical necessity. Not an atom moves, but as it is compelled to move. Nature forms the crystallization,

fructifies the plant, and organizes and vivifies the animal, neither by chance, nor by choice, but by necessity. To what purpose then are we hypothetically to suppose the existence of a spiritual and intelligent cause, to which we are to attribute effects already accounted for? Worlds move in their orbits according to the laws of gravitation; and gravitation is an attribute of matter. All the phænomena which astonish the ignorant, and alarm the superstitious—the thunder, the hurricane, the eclipse, the earthquake, the inundation, the pestilence—are traced by the philosopher to natural causes. Every conglomeration of inert matter, every concretion of animal substance, must be formed according to the laws and economy of nature. The health, or disease, both of the mind and of the body appears to the physician in the state of the corporeal organs. The modern chemist decomposes substances, which the ancient chemist believed to be elementary; but the former still finds an elementary substance beyond which he cannot go; and he still traces the combinations of matter to physical causes. It is by a *vis insita*—by a power inherent in matter, that the system of the universe is upheld. The astronomer gives an account of the motions and revolutions of the celestial bodies; explains the laws of the celestial mechanism; and shows how the planets regularly revolve in their orbits round the central sun; but he says nothing of spiritual influences, nothing of the interference of a

divine providence, while he discourses largely about the principle of gravitation, and the centripetal and centrifugal forces. Thus the physician, the chemist, and the astronomer, speak to us of nothing but matter, or the laws and principles of matter. Wherefore then should we look beyond the material world for the causes of organization and of life? If we find *in* nature the causes which maintain the order of the universe, why should we search *out* of nature for the causes which have produced plants and animals? If matter take certain forms, and move and act in certain capacities, by powers inherent in itself, and according to laws which are inseparable from its existence, there is surely no reason to deny that any form, motion, or action, which comes within our knowledge, may not be referred to matter, and the powers of matter. The difference of the modes, under which substance exists, affords no reason for imagining different substances to support those modes. The existence of substance supposes the existence of matter. Substance without matter is as much an ideal abstraction, and is as void of reality, as a surface without a substratum. A great philosopher has said *hypothesin non fingo*. Why are we to admit the hypothesis which supposes that an immaterial and intelligent being first gave existence to men and other animals? It is in vain to argue from final causes, that intellect directed the hand of Nature in the

conformation of living creatures. What could have been the final cause for arming the lion with its fangs, for putting the poison into the tooth of the serpent, for implanting in the heart of man the seeds of vice and misery? What could have been the moral intention in giving existence to a world, in which destruction keeps pace with generation, and evil with good?

In answer to these arguments it may be observed, that the materialist advances not a single step towards his object, in proving that multitudes of animals are generated in the mud of the Nile, or in any other mud. No one denies the influence of material causes. Where the seed is sown, and where the egg is deposited, if circumstances be favourable, the plant or the animal will be produced. That organized matter generates organized matter, is a fact disputed by none. But to generate is not to create. The materialist cannot show, that any animal was ever generated, where it was certain that the seeds of animal life did not previously exist. These seeds may not be perceptible to vision, or palpable to touch; but we are not therefore to conclude that they have had no existence. A seminal or animal matter is necessary to the generation of every living creature. It indeed often enters into the composition of other substances, is suspended in air, in water, and in various fluids, in which it remains latent, until developed under particular circumstances. Thus

fermentation helps its developement in liquors; and the eye of childhood gazes with wonder on the little serpents, which the microscope shows to be swimming in wine and vinegar. Again, animals are generated from the corruption of animal matter; and in all instances heat and moisture are material causes necessary to the formation of living creatures. "The Sun," says Hamlet, "being a God kissing carrion, breeds maggots in a dead dog." But surely we are not to admit that blind and unintelligent Nature has the power to create animals, because animal matter, which has been latent, becomes developed under certain circumstances by the aid of heat and moisture; or because new animals are generated in the corrupted mass of a putrified carcase. Generation is carried on by natural means; but it is still carried on according to the laws which the Author of nature has given to nature. We cannot attribute the fitness of things, the means adapted to the end, the parts proportioned to the whole, every where manifest in the visible world, to blind chance, or to blind necessity. It is said that the theist founds his reasoning upon an hypothesis, when he ascribes the original formation of animals to a spiritual and intelligent being. But a primary cause must have existed; and it is certainly not less hypothetical to assume the existence of a primary active principle which is material, than of one which is spiritual. If therefore the theist argue upon an hypothesis,

the materialist does so likewise. It is, however, surely more reasonable for intellectual beings to conclude that the cause of their existence is intellectual, than to conclude the reverse. From what other source than intellect could intellect flow? As order, proportion, and fitness, cannot fail to be recognised in the conformation of animals, it is clear that there was intention in their structure. The organization of every species of living creature is adapted to its state. Each distinct race is furnished with the means of supplying its wants, of providing for its safety, of preserving its existence, of continuing and propagating its kind, as far as its peculiar structure and corporeal conformation will permit. How admirably indeed are all animals made for the situations in which they are placed! The tiger is nourished by blood, and he is armed with fangs to seize and tear his prey. The beast of the field is furnished with the teeth necessary for cropping and grinding the herbs on which he feeds. The bear, with its coat of fur, seems formed to dwell on the shores of the frozen ocean; while the camel, with its several stomachs, and its reservoir for holding water, appears to have been intended by Providence for traversing the burning sands of the inhospitable desert. The waters teem with living creatures. All are fitted for the element in which they live; and as the finny tribes cleave the waves in countless multitudes, they evince in every evolution the skill which

contrived their organization. Neither can intention be questioned, when we see the birds of the air rising into that element; ascending, descending, revolving; as if they could at will suspend the laws of gravity. Turn your attention where you please, there is no organization without intention. Remark the forms of animals; observe their construction; see how their limbs are proportioned; contemplate the skill with which the parts are adjusted to each other; consider how their bodies are framed to their modes of existence. Examine as an anatomist the bones, the muscles, the jaws, the fangs, of the lion; and marvel at the powers of destruction, which are united in an animal that only lives by destruction. Examine as a mechanist the minute construction of the flea; and admire how that little insect, while it sucks the blood of its victim, is provided with the means of escape, and springs up into the air with a velocity so disproportioned to its mass, as almost to baffle the natural philosopher in calculating the powers. If we observe the organs of sense in animals, we find them wonderfully adapted to the use of each distinct species. How quick is the ear of the horse! how piercing is the eye of the hawk! how accurate is the sense of smell in the hound! how fine is the sense of touch, if it may be so termed, in the spider, that

"Feels in each thread, and lives along the line!"

Then mark how each organ is constructed differently for

the use of different animals. Observe in the dog over how large a surface, for the size of the head, the organ of smell is extended, and how numerous are the ramifications of the olfactory nerves. The *tunica retina* is of a dark colour in the eye of the eagle; and that bird soars above the summits of the mountains, in the full blaze of day, and looks undazzled on the sun; while in animals of the feline kind the *tunica retina* is of a white colour, and these animals are thus enabled to distinguish and pursue their prey by night. We may remark that the sense of self-preservation exists in all living creatures. Neither are the weaker animals left without the means of escape or defence. The timid hind finds her safety in flight; and she is so formed that she outstrips the winds in swiftness. The lordly bull places himself at the head of the herd, and menaces the foe with his terrible front. It is besides evident that Providence meant to put many of the weaker tribes under the protection of man, by rendering them useful and even necessary to his existence. This lord of the creation takes up arms in defence of his herds and flocks; and the wolf is driven back to the forest, and the tiger to the jungle. Now how is it possible, we ask, to consider these examples, and a thousand more might be easily adduced, without acknowledging that intention manifests itself in the conformation and organization even of brutes? But if we turn our attention to man, how

shall we fail to exclaim in the words of the sacred writer, that he is fearfully and wonderfully made? Let us contemplate his form; the organization of his body; above all, the faculties of his mind—let us look at the "human face divine," and then say, if we can, that man sprang from the womb of unconscious Nature, without owing his origin to the will of an all-wise and all-powerful Being. It has indeed been attempted to throw discredit on the doctrine of final causes. There could have been no moral intention, it is said, in giving existence to beasts of prey, to loathsome insects, and to noxious reptiles. It is thence inferred that such animals could not have owed their origin to a wise or benevolent being; and that as the moral intention cannot be shown, the final cause cannot be proved. It is in vain, adds the materialist, to speak of final causes in a world, where vice and misery are more predominant than virtue and happiness. In reply to these assertions we answer, that intention in the organization and conformation of animals has already been proved. Intention supposes intelligence. We find the means taken always admirably adapted to the end—always admirably calculated to fulfil the intention. We must therefore conclude that the original organization of the living creature was due to great intelligence united to great power. The materialist may argue as he will; he cannot get rid of the proofs of intention, and of the choice

of means, in the conformation of animals. He asks, where is the final cause to be found in the organization of the beast of prey? We answer, that the final cause, *quoad* the animal, is clearly apparent in its structure and organization. The beast of prey is formed for the state in which it is placed—it is fitted for the end for which it exists. It is in vain to ask what that end may be: for whatever might have been the purpose of the creation of the beast of prey, its organization proves that there was a purpose. Now the Being, that held that purpose, was no less than the Being who could create the animal. But to create an animal, the means and the power must be infinite; and infinite power cannot be divided, and can belong to one alone. To enquire what could have been the moral intention of the Deity in creating the lion, the wolf, or the serpent, is not our business here. Neither do we think it necessary to enter into any discussion concerning the origin of evil. Our arguments are only intended to show the fallacious reasoning of the materialist, when he attributes the primary existence of animals to any combination of physical causes. We have shown that intention is visible in the formation of every organized being; and that it is impossible to separate that intention from intelligence—even the highest intelligence. But the highest intelligence is infinite; and the Being that is infinitely wise is infinitely good. Whether then man, with his limited faculties, can, or cannot, discern

the moral intention, let his reason convince him, that it is idle to talk of power and life as resulting from unconscious matter. Matter, considered in itself, is essentially inert. Power is active. Life implies action and motion. All limited power must be derived from power that is infinite and eternal; and the stream of life must be traced back to a living source. Let not man forget his privilege to recognise himself as the work of the Creator. Let him remember that the God of Nature originally formed him to be what Sanchoniatho has called a *zophasemin*, a contemplator of heaven—let him recollect that God,

> *Pronaque cum spectent animalia cætera terram,*
> *Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque tueri*
> *Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.*

(9) Ζωφασημὶν, *zophasemin*—literally a contemplator, or observer of the heavens. This would be written, as Bochart has already remarked, צופה שמים *tsopheh shamaim* in Hebrew. But the Phœnician dialect, if I err not, approached more nearly to the Chaldaic than the Hebrew; and in Chaldaic the word would be written צופא שמין, *tsopha shamain*. The Phœnicians probably pronounced it *tsopha shamin*, or *shemin*; or *tsopha samin*, or *semin*.

(10) In the edition of 1544 the words of the text are thus given—καὶ ἀνεπλάσθη ὁμοίως ὠὸν σχήματι. In the edition of 1688 the word ὠὸν is omitted; but in the Latin version subjoined we find, *in ovi figuram conformatos*. I

cannot help thinking that the text of Philo has been mutilated here by the copyists. What is to be understood when we are told, that certain intelligent animals, contemplators of heaven, were formed in the shape of an egg? The Egyptians represented the world under the form of an egg; and Philo may have spoken to the same purpose.

(11) This is an interpolation, and the remark of Eusebius. To argue indeed that animals were originally formed by powers inherent in matter out of slime, is undoubtedly an atheistical doctrine; and I have therefore endeavoured to refute it in a preceding note. Neither is it a less untenable opinion to hold that the order of the universe, as originally established, is to be attributed to any material principle, whether called *love* by the ancients, or gravitation by the moderns. The clock goes, and goes according to the laws of gravity and motion; but we do not the less believe it to be the work of the clock-maker. How then shall it be imagined that the mighty machine of the universe has existed without a framer? How shall we fancy that planets revolve in their orbits, and keep their distances, attracting and repelling each other, without obeying some primordial law, that regulated their motions, and forbade confusion? The order, which we observe in the revolutions of the celestial bodies, must have been ordained by a being who knew the beauty of order. But the existence of the Deity is a truth that comes so home

to the feelings and understandings of men, whether civilised, or uncivilised, that I feel it to be almost a waste of time, when I combat the sophistry, however ingenious, that would controvert it.

(12) The whole of this account, it must be confessed, is vastly absurd. There are however inconsistencies in it, which may lead us to suspect that the translator has not done justice to the Phœnician author. We are first told that intelligent animals, observers of heaven, were generated out of animals that were not sentient; and afterwards we are informed that these same intelligent animals were awakened by the noise of the thunders. They had been already called observers of heaven, and yet it seems they had been all the while asleep.

(13) The Phœnicians, as well as the Egyptians, appear to have claimed Taautos for their countryman. The Abbé Mignot has endeavoured to trace this name to a Phœnician origin; but, as it appears to me, without success.

(14) The Greek has, ἔκ τε στοχασμῶν καὶ τεκμηρίων, which the Latin translator renders, *cum argumentis et conjecturis*. I must leave the learned reader to decide between the Latin version and mine. Taautos, it is to be presumed, wrote in hieroglyphic characters.

(15) These two winds were probably called in Phœnician רוח הדרום *ruach hadarom*, wind of the south, and

רוח הצפון *ruach hatsephon*, wind of the north. There was a deity named *Baal-tsephon;* and if we believe Aben Ezra, the idol of this deity was placed by the Egyptian magicians in the way of the Israelites to prevent them from going out of Egypt.

(16) The names of Aïon and Protogonos were probably חיה, *Chaiah*, *Life*, and בכור, *Bechor*, *First-born*. Αἰών, *aïon*, signifies *ævum*, *sæculum*, *vita*, *vitæ spatium*. We are told by the sacred historian, that *Chevah*, whom we call Eve, was so named as the mother כל חי, *col chai*, of all life.

Bochart has already explained the meaning of *Kolpias*. This is not the proper name of a man, as Philo seems to have fancied. It is to be resolved into the words קול־פי־יה *kol-pi-Jah*, *vox oris Domini*.

It is not with the same felicity that Bochart refers the name of *Baau* to בות, *buth*, which he interprets *night*, deriving this word, which is no where to be found, from the Chaldaic בית, *bith*, *pernoctavit*. I prefer the opinion of the Abbé Mignot, who thinks *Baau* to be the same as בהו, *bohu*, which is equivalent to chaos. In fact, if the Phœnicians changed the ה (*he*) into א (*aleph*), as the Chaldeans frequently did, they may have written באו, *baau*, for בהו, *bohu;* and this would be the very word in question.

(17) The Abbé Mignot thinks that the name, which

Philo has made *Genos*, was written קין *Kain* in the Phœnician original.

(18) It appears to me, that the Phœnician author has borrowed largely in this passage from the sacred writings of the Hebrews, with which Porphyry says he was well acquainted; but that his meaning has been totally mistaken by Philo, who has presented us with the *farrago* about the wind *Kolpias* and his wife *Baau*. I should think that what Sanchoniatho wrote might have been expressed nearly in the following terms—

ברא הרוח־הקול־פי־יה את אדם כן הבהו אשר חשך:
ויקרא הרוח־הקול־פי־יה את שם האדם בכור ואת
שם אשתו חיה: ויאכלה חיה כפרי העצים:
ונולדו להם קין וקינה וישבו אלה בהארץ כנען:

The breath of the voice of the mouth of Jah created man out of the void which is darkness. And the breath of the voice of the mouth of Jah called the name of the man Bechor (First-begotten) and the name of his wife Chaiah (Life). And Chaiah ate of the fruits of the trees. And to them were born Kain and Kainah; and these dwelt in the land of Canaan.

By the breath of the voice of the mouth of Jah is clearly to be understood the Spirit that spoke by the mouth of Jehovah.

Sanchoniatho, who might not have chosen to follow too

closely the Hebrew historian, seems nevertheless to indicate Adam by Protogonos.

The Phœnician writer, as I have already observed, probably named the first woman *Chaiah*. The Greeks generally suppressed the harsh aspirate of the Asiatics, which we render very imperfectly by the letters *ch;* but Philo, in dropping this aspirate, as well as the final *h*, which he could not express by an equivalent character in Greek, would pronounce and write *Aia*. This word he appears to have changed into *ἀϊὼν, aion*, which in one sense, at least, bears the same signification as *chaiah, life*.

(19) This name would be written בעל־שמים *Baal-shamaim* in Hebrew, and בל־שמין *Bel-shamain* in Chaldaic. Plautus writes it *Bal-samen*.

(20) The whole of this sentence is an evident interpolation. Who can for a moment think, that a Phœnician writer, who lived before the Trojan war, should discuss the question how the Greeks, (utter barbarians at that period,) understood and translated Oriental words and names?

(21) *Φῶς, καὶ Πῦρ, καὶ Φλόξ*—*Light, and Fire, and Flame*.—Probably expressed in Phœnician, as in Hebrew, by the words *aur, ash*, and *lahab*.

(22) *Τὸ Κάσσιον, καὶ τὸν Λίβανον, καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον, καὶ τὸ Βραθύ*. The mountains named here, Kassius, Libanon, Antilibanon, and Brathu, no doubt received their appella-

tions from the Syrians and Phœnicians. Bochart says that Mount Cassius was called קצי *Cassi* (rather *Katsi*) by the Syrians; and he adds, *id est, Terminalem dictum, quia Ægyptum Syriamque disterminat: Herodotus L.* 2.—ἀπὸ τοῦ Κασίου οὔρεος τοῦ οὐρίζοντος Αἴγυπτόν τε καὶ Συρίην (*from Mount Kassius, which divides Egypt and Syria*). The root therefore is קצה, *katseh, finis, extremitas.* I have already spoken of the name of Lebanon, and have given its etymology in a former chapter. I am disposed to think that Brathu is a corruption for the name of a mountain called ברותה, *Berothah*, mentioned by Ezekiel (xlvii. 16.). The name indeed seems to be derived from ברות, *beroth*, a shrub, or small tree; and the mountain might have received its appellation from the shrubs, or trees, which grew on it. The word was commonly written ברוש, *berosh*, in Hebrew; but the Chaldeans frequently changed the ש into ת. I observe that both Vossius and Mazzochi derive the Latin *bruta* from *beroth*.

(23) The Abbé Mignot thus comments on this passage —*au lieu de* Μημροῦμος καὶ ὁ Ὑψουράνιος, *qu'on lit dans le texte de Philon de Byblos, il devoit y avoir* Μημροῦμος ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος, *Memrumus qui et Hypsouranios; Memrumus, autrement nommé Hypsouranios. Cette faute n'est point la seule que je remarque dans ce texte: à ce Memroumos, autrement nommé Hypsouranius, Sanchoniaton avoit joint immédiatement le nom d'un autre personnage. Sa phrase,*

qui commence par un pluriel, ἐκ τοῦτων ἐγεννήθησαν, *et qui continue de même, exige deux noms au moins; en effet, Sanchoniaton à Memroumos avoit joint Ousoos, que quelques lignes après il appelle son frère. Pour rétablir ce texte, tel qu'il devoit être dans l'exemplaire original de Philon de Byblos, on doit donc lire,* ἐκ τοῦτων ἐγεννήθησαν Μημρούμος, ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος, καὶ Οὔσωος; *de ceux-ci naquirent Memrumus autrement nommé Hypsouranios, et Ousous. Le terme Grec* Ὑψουράνιος, *aussi haut que le ciel, par lequel Philon de Byblos a rendu le mot de son original, a fait soupçonner avec raison à Bochart, que le mot Phénicien employé par Sanchoniaton n'étoit pas* מרום (il faut lire ממרום) *Memroum; en effet* Ὑψουράνιος *est composé de deux mots,* ὑψὸς, *hauteur, élévation ou élevé, et* οὔρανος, *le ciel. Ces deux mots devoient correspondre à deux mots Phéniciens, qui sont* רום, *roum, altus, et* שמים *shamaim ou* (שמין) *shemen* (shemin), *le ciel ou les cieux. Le nom Phénicien, rendu par le Grec* Ὑψουράνιος, *étoit donc* שמימרום, *shamimroum, ou shemenroum, aussi haut, aussi élevé que le ciel: le terme qui désigne la comparaison n'étoit peut-être point exprimé, parce qu'il est assez d'usage, dans la langue Hébraïque, de le supprimer.*

I perfectly agree with the learned Academician, that the text of Philo should be corrected as he proposes; ἐκ τοῦτων ἐγεννήθησαν Μημρούμος, (ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος,) καὶ Οὔσωος; *of these were born Memroumos, (the same as*

Hypsouranios,) and Otsoos. But I cannot agree with him, or with Bochart, with regard to the word *Memroumos.* This word was no doubt intended to represent the Phœnician name; as *Hypsouranios* (High as Heaven), was intended to explain the sense in Greek. I cannot, however, consent to restore it under the form of Σαμημρούμος, *Samemroumos.* It appears to me that שמים־רום, *shamaim-roum,* is a form that the Hebrew language cannot take. I should rather think that Sanchoniatho wrote ממרום־השמים, *Memroum-hashamaim, from the height of the Heavens;* or perhaps only ממרום, *Memroum, from on high, one that had come from on high.* As Philo gives the name *Memroumos,* this last supposition seems to be the best founded.

The passage runs thus in the edition of 1544—ἐκ τούτων φησὶν, ἐγεννήθησαν Μημρούμος, ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος. ἀπὸ μητέρων δὲ, φησὶν, ἐχρημάτιζον τῶν τότε γυναικῶν ἀναίδην μισγομένων οἷς ἂν ἐντύχοιεν. In a subsequent edition, in which we find Μημρούμος καὶ ὁ Ὑψουράνιος, the Latin translation is thus given—*Cæterum ab iis Memrumus et Hypsuranius procreati sunt; qui a matribus ejusmodi appellationes invenere, mulierculis, inquam, illis quæ sui copiam eo tempore obvio cuilibet impudentissime faciebant.* But *Hypsuranius* is only the Greek version of *Memrumus.* It is clear then that the emendation proposed by the Abbè Mignot is necessary to the sense, since it is obvious that Μημρούμος, ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος, is the proper reading; and the

name of *Ousoos* has been evidently omitted by the copyists. But these persons were named by their mothers. This appears to have been the custom of the East from the earliest times. Eve gave names to her sons. Leah and Rachel also chose the denominations of their children.

(24) The name which Philo writes Οὔσωος, *Ousoos*, might have been עזוז, *Ozoz*, in the original. Ozoz signifies *fortis*. The ancient Arabians denominated the sun العزيز, *Al Oziz*, that is, *the Glorious, the Excellent*.

(25) These names in Phœnician were probably צד, *tsaid*, *venator*, and דיג, *daig*, *piscator*. The persons thus called were probably the same as Tsidon and Dagon afterwards mentioned. Sanchoniatho seems to have collected different histories, which have been thrown into one narrative by Philo.

(26) It cannot be doubted that Chrysor is a Greek corruption for the Phœnician name, whatever that might have been. The Greeks, from the earliest periods of their literature, had always the *mania* of deriving foreign words and names from their own language. Hesiod tells us that Chrysaor was so named,

——ὅτ' ἄρ' Ὠκεανοῦ περὶ πηγὰς
Γείνεθ', ὁ δ' ἄορ χρύσειον ἔχεν μετὰ χερσὶ φίλῃσι.

Because when he was born by Ocean's founts,
He held in his loved hands a golden sword.

A learned Commentator of Hesiod derives Chrysaor from חריס אור, which he says signifies *custos* in the Oriental dialects. There is no such word in Hebrew as חריס, *custos*. The writer should have put the word in Arabic characters حرس. I prefer the etymology proposed by Bochart, and stated below. It would be a pity if, after such an assertion, it should be found that no such word exists. חרס, *cheres*, signifies the sun. חרס־אור would signify the sun of light; the brilliant sun; the sun of fire; the fiery sun.

Mr. Bryant, whose Analysis of ancient mythology I have lately received from England, thinks that Chrysor is a corruption for Chus-Orus. But what possible resemblance can be imagined between Cush, the son of Ham, the Egyptian God Horus, and the Phœnician Chrysor, who is said to have sprung from a race of hunters and fishers? The words, indeed, which state Chrysor to have been the same with Hephaistos, are evidently interpolated, since the Phœnician author was not likely to know any thing of the lame deity of Lemnos. There is however still no point of comparison remaining between Cush, Horus, and Chrysor. This last personage seems to have been at once an orator, a poet, a prophet, a fisherman, and a sailor; characters not very usually united; but nobody ever heard that Cush made fishing hooks; or that Horus dealt in poetry and predictions. It may then be questioned

what either had to do with Chrysor, or indeed with each other. Are we really to unite the names of Cush and Horus together, upon the supposition that the Greeks found them united, and made out of them the name of Chrysor? But it is wasting time to say more of this idle etymology. Mr. Bryant was a man possessed of much learning and talent; but his etymologies are generally untenable.

Bochart says, *Vulcani nomen Chrysor Phœnicibus erat* חרש־אור, *chores-ur, id est,* πυριτεχνίτης, *qui ignis opera metalla fabricat in quasvis formas.* I have no doubt that Bochart is right. The name may have been written חרוש־אור *Chrus-aor* in Phœnician; or Philo may have thus supplied the *vau* in pronouncing the word. It is obvious however that Bochart has given the elemental form of the name, which the Greek translator meant to make intelligible to his own countrymen, when he stated Chrysor to be the same as Hephaistos. Thus in addition to all his other occupations Chrysor was a smith, a worker in metals. He was probably the Tubal-Kain of Scripture. But Sanchoniatho may have meant to speak allegorically. Men first dwelt in huts, and under sheds. They lived by hunting and fishing; but gradually became acquainted with the liberal and useful arts.

(27) We had been told before that Ousoos was the first who had ventured on the sea. The Phœnician

writer had no doubt stated the different traditions which existed in his time; but the Greek translator, in neglecting to distinguish between these traditions, and in failing to point them out as distinct from each other, has left this fragment in a state of inextricable perplexity. It must however be confessed that Sanchoniatho himself appears to have had no clear notions of chronology.

(28) I consider this name, *Διαμίχιος*, as equivalent to *μηχανητὴς*, *machinator*. It was probably expressed in Phœnician by חרש, which, as you choose to supply it, may be sounded *choras*, *chros*, *chrus*. This word signifies *faber*, *artifex*, *machinator*. Thus it appears clear that the person in question was generally called *Chrus*, from the various arts which he cultivated, and from the works which he fabricated; but that he was more particularly named *Chrus-aor*, from his working in metals by the aid of fire.

(29) The person described here was a builder of houses. I doubt, therefore, whether Philo can have properly rendered the Phœnician name by *τεχνίτης*, *fabricator*. The original name probably specified the employment of the workman, and designed him as a builder. I should consequently suppose the Phœnician word to have been גדר, *goder*, *faber murarius;* or perhaps גבל, *gibal*, *lapicida*. The *Gibalim* were master-masons, who put the finishing hand to Solomon's temple.

(30) τὸν δὲ Γήϊνον Αὐτόχθονα. Sanchoniatho certainly seems to have borrowed many of the names which he mentions from the Hebrew Scriptures; but he has paid no attention to dates, or to the order of succession; and has confounded the names of the Patriarchs with those of mythological persons. Bochart thinks that he here meant Adam. It will be found that he afterwards gives the name of *Autocthon* to the Protoplast. It is however possible that Philo may have found the word קין, *Kain*, a proper name, in the Phœnician, which he has changed into *Geïnos, terrenus;* and further explained by the addition of *Autocthon*. Or perhaps he found other words after *Kain*, which he interpreted by *Autocthon*. These words might have been איש האדמה, literally, *a man of the earth*, but which was apparently the phrase used to denote *a cultivator of the soil—a tiller of the ground*.

(31) Ἀγρὸς, Ἀγρούηρος, Ἀγρότης. These names signify literally *field, field-loving, a rustic*, or *farmer*. The image of this last was highly venerated, says the author; his shrine was carried through Phœnice on a yoke; and he himself was adored as the greatest of the Gods. This account seems very singular. I much suspect that the Phœnician original has been ill interpreted by the Greek translator.

Multo absurdum est, says Bochart, *quod ex Geïno, id est Adamo, nasci facit Deum Ἀγρότην. Nam Ἀγρότης*

ille est Deus שדי, *Sadai*; *Ἀγρότην reddidit Philo quasi fiat a* שדה, *sade, id est ab agro, ut observavit Scaliger.*

In order that the reader may fully understand the remark of Bochart, I shall lay before him a list of words connected with שדי. In doing so I shall employ the masoretic punctuation, in order more clearly to show how far the language of Sanchoniatho may have been equivocal; but without attaching any importance to this punctuation beyond the object which I have in view.

שָׁדַד, *shadad, vastavit, destruxit.*

שֵׁד, *shed, Dæmon.* The Philistines and other idolaters worshipped deities whom they called *Shedim.* Thus it is said, (Deut. xxxii.) חבחו שדים לא אלה, *and they sacrificed to Shedim, not to God.* These deities, or dæmons, were supposed to possess the means, and to exercise the powers of destruction.

שַׁדַּי, *shadai, omnipotens.* God says, (Exod. vi.) *I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob,* באל שדי (*anne* כאל ?) *as God Almighty.* Now by *El Shadai* we are to understand the mighty God, who having created, has the power to destroy all things. God is to be adored under the name of *El Shadai,* as the God of power and of judgment—under the name of *Jehovah,* as the God of grace and of existence. Such is the doctrine of the Rabbin.

شد, *shad,* (Arab.) *impetum fecit.*

شدة, *shaduth*, (Arab.) *impetus, violentia, irruptio.*

Destruction, and power that can destroy, are the ideas which I have hitherto marked as connected with *shadad* and its derivatives. But the original meaning of the word *shadad* seems to have been *fudit, effudit, &c.* The Chaldeans and Syrians have retained this primitive sense in various words, of which I consider *shadad* to be the root. In fact the ideas of destruction and devastation are naturally suggested by the torrent, when pouring down from the mountains, and inundating the valleys. But to return to our examples.

שְׁדָא, *sheda*, (Chald. and Syr.) *fudit, effudit.*

שִׁדְיוֹת, *shidioth*, (Chald.) *effusiones.*

שַׁד, *shad*, (Heb. and Chald.) *mamma, uber:* "a breast or teat which pours forth milk." Parkhurst. See also Montaldi *in verbo.*

We now come to the root *sadad* and its derivatives.

שָׂדַד, *sadad, planus, rectus fuit*, Kal. שִׂדֵּד, *sided, planum fecit*, Piel.

שָׂדֶה, *sadeh, campus, ager.* Perhaps properly *planities.*

שֵׂדִים, *sedeim ;* (in regim. שְׂדֵי, *sedei,*) *campi.*

שְׂדֵי, *sedei, campus.* Consult Parkhurst *in voce* שדה.

سد, *sad*, (Arab.) *obstruxit—item, planum fecit.*

It is evident that many of these words, if taken singly, could not be distinguished from each other without the help of the points. Let us take the word שדי for example.

This word may signify,—*my dæmon—my breast—Almighty—field—fields.* It is true that I would much oftener trust to being guided by the general sense of the sentence, than depend for its explanation on the masoretic punctuation, which I consider as of very little authority, and which was invented several centuries after the Christian æra. This punctuation, indeed, to which I seldom think it worth while to pay attention, can only be of use to the reader in the present instance, by enabling him at once to perceive how the text of Sanchoniatho might have borne an equivocal sense. The Phœnician author employed characters similar to the Samaritan. What are called vowel-points were totally unknown in his time. I shall endeavour to give what I think may have been the original passage, written however in Chaldaic letters, and according to the Hebrew orthography:

שני אישים אחרים נולדו אחרי הם: שם האחד אכר ושם השני
שדי כי אהב השדים: סגד העם את צלם שדי ונשא את סכותו
על עול בהארץ כנען: הוא נקרא בהספרים אל אלים הגדול:

After them were born two other men. The name of the first was Achar (Agricola); and the name of the second was Sedei, because he loved the fields (sedeim). The people venerated his image, and carried his tabernacle on a yoke through the land of Canaan; the same was called in the books the great God of Gods.

The reader will observe here, that Sanchoniatho calls the second person by a name, which might be sounded either שדי, *Sedei, field,* or שדי, *Shadai, Almighty.* He also says that this person loved the שדים, or was the friend of the שדים, which word, if sounded *sedeim,* would mean fields; but which, if sounded *shadeim,* or *shedim,* would signify the deities worshipped by idolaters. The Phœnician author says that the image of this *Sedei,* or *Shadai,* was carried in a shrine, or temple, on a yoke. It will be remembered that the Philistines, when they brought back the ark, had it drawn by milch-kine on which no yoke had come. The reader will recollect the words of Amos—*But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun, your images, the star of your God.* It was evidently because the idolaters had the custom of carrying about the small shrines, or tabernacles, of their Gods on yokes, that the Philistines were ordered to employ kine on which no yoke had come, (that is to say which had not been used for the service of idolaters,) when they were to take back the ark of Jehovah.

(32) The Greek has σπήλαια, *caves.* These were probably chambers without windows, used as dormitories.

(33) ἐκ τούτων ἀγρόται καὶ κυνηγοί. οὗτοι δὲ καὶ Ἀλῆται καὶ Τιτᾶνες. The word κυνηγοὶ signifies literally *dog-leaders.* The Ἀλῆται were wanderers, who had no fixed habitation. They were probably named נודדים, *Nodadim,*

in the original, as the Abbé Mignot has already observed. The *Τιτᾶνες* were so named from טיט *tit*, slime, clay; not indeed because they were the children of the earth, as the Greek mythologists fabled them to be; but, as Sanchoniatho plainly indicates, because they were labourers of the soil.

(34) *Ἄμυνος καὶ Μάγος*. Amynos, says the Abbé Mignot, comes from the Phœnician אמן, *aman*, to be faithful, &c.; and Magos from מוג, *mog*, which signifies, says the Abbé, *être foible, s'ecouler, se dissiper, &c.* I agree with the learned Academician in both of these etymologies.

(35) *Μισὼρ καὶ Συδύκ*. The first of these names was probably מישור in Phœnician. It is derived from שרה, *sharah, solvit*. The second is clearly צדיק, *tsadik, justus*. This, it will be remembered, is the epithet given to Noach in Scripture.

(36) The words between the brackets are evidently interpolated.

(37) *Διόσκουροι, Dioskouroi; Jovis pueri*. Damascius says, *Σαδύκω γὰρ ἐγένοντο παῖδες, οὓς Διοσκούρους ἑρμηνεύουσι καὶ Καβείρους—there were sons born to Saduk, whose names are interpreted Dioskouroi and Kabeiroi*. We receive the following information from Cicero— *Διόσκουροι etiam apud Græcos multis modis nominantur. Primi tres, qui appellantur Anaces, Athenis ex Jove, rege antiquissimo, et Proserpina nati, Tritopatreus, Eubuleus, Dionysus. Se-*

cundi, Jove tertio nati ex Leda, Castor et Pollux. Tertii dicuntur a nonnullis Alco, et Melampus, Emolus, Atrei filii, qui Pelope natus fuit. The Greeks, according to custom, made all this mythology their own. But Cicero gives us the key by which we may explain the name which Sanchoniatho employed, and which Philo has rendered by Dioskouroi. The first three Dioskouroi were called *Anaces.* We may be pretty certain that this name was ענקים, *Anakim,* in Phœnician. Frequent mention is made of the Anakim in Scripture; but it is not easy to understand why these בני־ענק, *beni-Anak,* sons of Anak, should be called by the Phœnician author sons of Tsadik. It may be curious to enquire how the Greeks came to denominate them Dioskouroi. The Greeks, who visited Phœnice, might hear much of the *beni-Anak,* sons of Anak. They easily changed the Phœnician Anak into their own word ἄναξ, *anax, king;* and the sons of Anak soon became οἱ παῖδες τοῦ ἀνάκτος—*the sons of the king.* But who was this king? Jupiter no doubt. Thus the beni-Anak, or Anakim, were understood to be *Dioskouroi, Jovis pueri.*

The Greeks describe the *Kabeiroi* sometimes as gods, and sometimes as priests. Thus the scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius (L. 1.) holds them to be the same with Ceres, Proserpine, Pluto, and Mercury; while Strabo (L. 10.) classes them with the Curetes, the Dactyli, and

the Telchines. The word Κάβειροι, *Kabeiroi*, is derived by some writers from גבירים *gabirim, fortes, validi.* Others believe it to have been written כאבירים, *cabirim;* and to have been composed of the particle כ, *like, as,* and אבירים, *abirim, mighty ones.* In this case the *cabirim* were originally similitudes, images, of the great gods of the Phœnicians.

It is difficult to tell what was the origin of the name of the Korybantes. Some Greek writers say that the Korybantes were the sons of Korybas, the son of Iasus and Cybele. The author of the Etymologicon Magnum proposes other origins of the name, which are not worth repeating. The word was originally Phœnician, and it is losing time to seek for its source in Greek. I observe that in Hebrew the word קרבן, *koreban,* signifies an oblation, or sacrifice. The priests employed in offering sacrifices might have been denominated from this word. The verb קרב, *karab,* signifies *appropinquavit;* but it also means to offer up, to offer any thing as an oblation. (See Levit. i. 5.) The Korybantes, therefore, were not δαίμονές τινες, as the Greeks chose to call them, but more probably the priests who offered sacrifices to the Gods of the Phœnicians and Phrygians.

(38) Are we to understand from this, that Ousoos and Chrysor, already mentioned as navigators, had braved the dangers of the sea in boats?

(39) עליון, *Elion*, Most High. Melchi-tsedek, king of justice, was כהן אל עליון, *Cohen El Elion*, Priest of God Most High. (Gen. xiv.)

(40) Ὕψιστος, *Hypsistos*, *Altissimus*, Most High.

(41) Βήρουθ. The orthography might have been ברות in the Phœnician; but still I conceive the word to have been the same with the Hebrew ברית.

(42) This passage is very remarkable, and deserves particular attention. I am of opinion, that Philo did not clearly comprehend it, and that he has mistaken the sense of the original with respect to the word *berith*, which he writes *berouth*, and which he has made the proper name of a female. I shall submit the Greek of Philo to the consideration of the reader, and I shall then lay before him what I should suppose to have been nearly the original text of Sanchoniatho. I shall however employ, as usual, the Hebrew orthography.

The Greek version of Philo:

Κατὰ τούτους γίνεταί τις Ἐλιοῦν, καλούμενος Ὕψιστος, καὶ θήλεια λεγομένη Βήρουθ, οἳ καὶ κατώκουν περὶ Βύβλον. ἐξ ὧν γεννᾶται Ἐπίγειος ἢ Αὐτόχθων, ὃν ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν Οὐρανόν· ὡς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς στοιχεῖον δι' ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ κάλλους ὀνομάζειν οὐρανόν. γεννᾶται δὲ τούτῳ ἀδελφὴ ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων, ἣ καὶ ἐκλήθη Γῆ, καὶ διὰ τὸ κάλλος ἀπ' αὐτῆς, φησὶν, ἐκάλεσαν τὴν ὁμώνυμον γῆν.

Among these was born a certain Elion, called Most

High, and a female named Berouth; and they dwelt near Byblos. From them sprang Terrene, or Indigenous, whom they afterwards called Heaven; as also from him the element above us, on account of the excellence of its beauty, is named heaven. But there was born to Heaven, of those before-mentioned, a sister, who was called Earth; and on account of her beauty, they say, the earth was called by the same name.

The original Phœnician text as I suppose it to have been written by Sanchoniatho.

ויהי בתוכם איש אחד עליון בעל ברית וישבו הוא ואשתו
על ביובל: וילד עליון בן ושמן אדם כי נוצר מן האדמה:
אחרי־כן אדם נקרא שם והרקיע עליונו כי טוב ראי נקרא
שם: ויהי לשם אחות ושמה אדמה ויקרא שם את הארץ
כשם אדמה אחותו כי טבה מראהמאד:

I am disposed to think that Sanchoniatho spoke of *Baal-berith;* and that Philo mistook his meaning. The word *baal* is often used to signify *husband,* and Philo may have interpreted *baal-berith, husband of Berith.* With regard to the proper name which he has rendered by *Ouranos* (Heaven) I can have no doubt that it was *Shem.* The word שם, *shem,* may have been used by the Phœnicians to signify *heaven,* though the Hebrews always employ the plural form שמים, *shemim.* The name of *Epigeios,* or *Autocthon,* which I have rendered *Terrene* and *Indigenous,*

(to avoid circumlocution,) was probably Adam in the original. I can find no other way of interpreting *Autochthon* as a proper name in Hebrew; and we must not be surprised at the confusion which reigns in the whole account. Sanchoniatho appears to have mingled, without paying the slightest attention to dates, what he remembered of the sacred records of the Hebrews with the mythological fictions of the Phœnicians. Neither did he hesitate to introduce repeatedly the same person under different names into different parts of his narrative. These faults are, however, perhaps to be attributed, at least in part, to his translator, as I have observed in the beginning of this chapter.

But to return to the passage in question. I have little doubt that Philo found *Baal Berith* in the original. It might be difficult for him to understand what could be the signification of these words, if *berith* were not a proper name. He might consequently read *Elion, baal Berith, Elion, husband of Berith;* a sense which the words will undoubtedly bear. In fact he might be unable to comprehend the same words in any other sense. Had Elion been denominated Baal, or Lord, of Berytus, the fact would no doubt have been mentioned by Philo, who seems to have never hesitated to introduce an interpolation when he thought it necessary. But it clearly appears that he understood *berith* to have been the name of a female.

On the other hand, we may reasonably conclude that he mistook the sense, because it is to be remembered, that Sanchoniatho might most naturally have introduced the name of *Baal-berith* into his writings. He flourished at the very time when the worship of *Baal-berith* prevailed in the land of Israel, and when Jerubaal, whom Porphyry calls Ἱερομβάλος, was ruler over that country. Having given more attention to the passage, than I had done when I spoke of it in a former chapter, I am now disposed to think, not only that the Phœnician writer meant the *Baal-berith* mentioned in the book of Judges, but that this name signifies *Lord of the covenant*, and not *Lord of purification*, as Parkhurst seems so understand it. I therefore conclude it to be probable, that Noach was worshipped by his idolatrous descendants as *Lord of the covenant;* which might signify either a deity worshipped under that name, or simply the covenanter. Thus בעלי ברית אברם, signifies *covenanters with Abram.* (Gen. xiv. 13.) The expression is idiomatic. Consequently Noach, whose covenant with Jehovah must have been long remembered by his descendants, might have been first called *baal-berith, covenanter*, and might have been afterwards adored as a deity under the same name. The adorers of the Sun personified that luminary, and worshipped him under the title of Baal. But they also frequently identified the personified Sun with Noach. This point has been clearly proved by

several writers; and particularly by Messrs. Bryant and Faber. It was probably of Noach, identified with the personified Sun, that Sanchoniatho spoke under the name of Elion. This name, signifying *most high*, was a title given by the heliolaters to the object of their worship. It was no doubt for this reason, that Abraham did not say, that he had lifted up his hand to *El Elion*, but to *Jehovah El Elion*. (Gen. xiv.)

Sanchoniatho appears to have likewise identified the personified Heaven with Shem, the son of Noach; and to have stated that Shem was originally called Adam, which name Philo renders by *Epigeios* and *Autocthon*. In all the Pagan cosmogonies the heavens and the earth were supposed to have been originally confounded together in a chaotic state. The Phœnician writer may have remembered, that the Hebrew Scriptures represented the earth as originally void and inform, and that God afterwards made the firmament. He may therefore have wished to indicate that his personified Heaven, an object of adoration among idolaters, had been formed out of the terrene matter of which the earth itself was made; and he accordingly describes this personified Heaven as first bearing the name of Adam, who was formed out of the earth. The name of Shem, which might be interpreted Heaven, favoured the disposition of the idolaters to identify the names of the Patriarchs with those of their own

deities. The Patriarchs were no doubt highly venerated by their descendants. To associate them with the objects of Tsabean worship was a matter of no small importance to the cause of idolatry. In the case before us the name of Shem, signifying heaven, answered the purposes of the worshippers of the hosts of heaven. There were many names which were less suitable; and they appear to have been changed to others more convenient. This is probably the real reason, why we hear so little, or indeed nothing, of Noach under his proper name from the mythologists, whether of Egypt, or of Asia. But still I can have little doubt, that Noach, though not directly called by that name, was identified with the personified Sun. Shem more easily, and more evidently, was identified with the personified heaven.

I shall now submit to the consideration of the reader a literal translation of the Phœnician given above.

And there was among them a certain man, Elion (*Most High*) *Baal-berith,* (*Lord of the covenant*); *and he and his wife dwelt near Biubel* (*Byblos*). *And Elion begot a son, and his name was Adam, because he was formed out of the earth. Afterwards Adam was called Shem, and the firmament above us, because it is beautiful to behold, was called Shem* (*Heaven*). *And Shem had a sister, and her name was Adamah* (*earth*); *and Shem called the earth after the name of his sister Adamah, be-*

cause she was very fair to look on (or, *was of a very beautiful aspect*).

(43) In stating that Elion, (Hypsistos) was killed by wild beasts, Sanchoniatho plainly shows that by the *Most High* he meant the personified Sun. Thus the Phœnicians represented Adonis, another personification of the Sun, as having been killed by a wild boar. The mythologists feigned that the Sun expired and revived annually; and the wild beasts of which Sanchoniatho speaks were probably the zodiacal animals.

(44) *Ilos, the same as Kronos.* Damascius says that the Phœnicians and Syrians called Kronos, *El,* and *Bel,* and *Bolathen;* which were therefore אל, *El,* בל, *Bel,* and בל־איתן, *Bel-aiton,* or *Bel-iton;* or perhaps בעל־איתן, *Baal-aiton,* which the Syrians would pronounce *Bol-aiton.* These names, which signify *Deus, Dominus,* and *Dominus fortis,* were all solar appellations. Kronos, or Saturn, was no other than the Sun, worshipped as the God and regulator of time. *Saturnus ipse, qui auctor est temporum, et ideo a Græcis immutata litera Κρόνος quasi Χρόνος vocatur, quid aliud nisi Sol intelligendus est?* Macrob. L. 1.

(45) *Betulos* is here named as one of the sons of *Ouranos.* Of this deity no mention is made by any other writer; and I am persuaded that Philo has mistaken the sense of the original. Sanchoniatho probably wrote

אל האל בית־אל, *El, Hel Beth-el, El, the God of Beth-el.* It will be remembered that Bethel was the place chosen by Jeroboam for the celebration of idolatrous rites. It was there he placed one of his golden calves. Now we are assured by Kimchi, one of the most learned of the Rabbin, that the idol of Moloch had the form of a calf. It is probable therefore that Moloch was the deity adored by Jeroboam in Bethel. But when the Greeks and Latins spoke of Moloch, they always gave him the name of Kronos or Saturn. Thus there can be no doubt that the God to whom the Carthaginians sacrificed children was no other than Moloch; and the writers of Greece and Rome always denominate this cruel deity Kronos and Saturn. Now since the God of Bethel was Moloch, and Moloch was Kronos; and since no such God as *Betulos* was ever heard of, I would read for *Ἴλον, τὸν καὶ Κρόνον, καὶ Βέτυλον—Ἴλον, (τὸν καὶ Κρόνον,) τὸν θεὸν Βεθήλου*; the original having been *El, Hel Bethel, El, the God of Bethel. El* seems to have been used, like Baal and Melech, or Moloch, as a solar title. It properly signifies *Deus, Deus fortis.* There can be little doubt that this word was that of which Philo has made *Ilos.*

(46) *καὶ Δαγὼν, ὅς ἐστι Σίτων.* See what I have said of *Dagon* in the first volume of this work. I shall only add here that דג, *dag, piscis,* is the root. Thence was formed the verb דגה, *dagah, multiplicari, fœcundari more piscium.*

From this last word came דגן, *dagan*, *frumentum*—corn being so called from the multiplying and fecundating of the seed. The deity worshipped by the Philistines and Phœnicians was called *Dagon*, as representing the fecundating power of the Sun. The idol had the head and hands of a man, and the body and tail of a fish. Accordingly when the ark of Jehovah was placed in the temple of Dagon, the head and hands of the idol fell down, and when the Philistines entered the temple they found the דג, *dag*, the fish, alone remaining in its place. But *Dagon*, considered as the representative of the fecundating power of the Sun, was principally worshipped as the God of corn. Hence Philo explains the name by putting it into Greek Σίτων, *frumentarius*.

(47) Diodorus Siculus (L. 3.) likewise calls Atlas the brother of Kronos. Eupolemus, cited by Eusebius, (Pr. Ev. L. 9.) says that Atlas was the same with Enoch. If Atlas was a real person, his history has been strangely altered by the mythologists, who represent him as one of the Titans, and who tell us that Jupiter placed the heavens on his shoulders, and that Perseus showed him the Gorgon's head, and changed him into a mountain.

(48) It is difficult to guess how the name of Hermes Trismegistus could have been expressed in Phœnician. If the passage be not interpolated, which I much suspect, it would seem that Sanchoniatho considered the Egyptian Osiris to be the same with the Phœnician Kronos, since

he could not have been ignorant, that Hermes, or rather Thoth, was represented by the Egyptians as the friend, counsellor, and secretary of Osiris.

(49) *Persephone and Athena.* It appears from the scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius, that Proserpine was called *Axiokersa* by the Samothracians. Bochart says that this name is composed of אחז, *achaz, possessio,* and קרץ, *kerets, excidium.* I cannot give my assent to this etymology. But the name of *Axiokersa* was probably only given to Proserpine in the mysteries. That which Sanchoniatho employed might have been לילית, *Lilith,* the name of the Phœnician Hecate.

Five different goddesses are enumerated by Cicero as bearing the name of Athena, or Minerva. He says that the third was the daughter of Jupiter; but, according to Arnobius, she was *Saturni filia, et quæ usum excogitavit armorum.* (Arnob. adv. Gent.) The name then that Philo found in the text of Sanchoniatho might have been איתנה, *Aitenah,* which signifies *fortis, virilis.* The Greeks appear to have composed the character of their Athena out of that of the Egyptian Neitha, and out of the sense of this Phœnician word *aitenah.* They again confounded the signification of this name with that of the word אתן, *aton,* or *iton,* which signifies *a forge,* because arms and armour, over which Minerva presided, were fabricated in forges. Hence this Goddess was said to be married to Vulcan, to whom she bore Ericthonius. Ἀθηνᾶ τινὶ

Βασιλιδι.....Ἥφαιστος γάμῳ μιγεὶς, γεννᾷ Ἐριχθόνιον. (Tzez. in Lycophr.) Another Greek writer says, *ὅθεν αὐτὴν ἐθεοποίησαν Ἕλληνες, καθάπερ καὶ τὴν πολεμικωτάτην Ἀθηνᾶν Ἰτωνίου μὲν ὑπάρχουσαν θυγατέρα*—*Whence the Greeks ranked her among the Gods, as the most warlike Athena, and daughter of Itonius.* Now this passage shows, if I err not, that the name of Athena was considered by some, at least, of the Greeks as connected with the Phœnician words cited above. The name of *Itonius* seems clearly to be derived from אתן, *aton,* or *iton, a forge.*

(50) I can have little doubt that this name should have been written *Temarous,* or *Tamarqus,* instead of *Demarous.* Mention is afterwards made of the same personage, when he is called *Ζεὺς Δημαροῦς, Jupiter Demarous.* I am inclined to think that Sanchoniatho spoke of בעל־תמר, *Baal-Tamar.* There was a city called after the name of this deity. (Judg. xx. 33.) *Tamar* signifies *φοίνιξ, palma;* and this was a tree peculiarly consecrated to the Sun. It was therefore probably that luminary which was worshipped under the name of *Baal-tamar, Dominus palmæ.*

(51) The river Adonis fell into the sea at Byblos, and I take this name to be a corruption for באיובל, *Baiubel,* which signifies the entrance of the river.

(52) *Eloeim.* It is true that judges and magistrates, as well as angels and dæmons, were sometimes named אלהים. But if Sanchoniatho had read the Hebrew

Scriptures, as Porphyry says, and as this fragment itself attests, he must have known to whom the word in question was applied κατ' ἐξοχήν. It may therefore be suspected, that he purposely referred its origin to the name of the Phœnician deity whom he called *El*.

(53) *Sadidos*. The root, whence this name is apparently taken, does not exist in Hebrew; but we find it in Arabic, in which language سد, *sad*, signifies *obstruxit*; though varying from this sense, سديد, *sadid*, means *bene directus*. I greatly suspect, however, that Sanchoniatho wrote סריר, *Sarir*, which is evidently to be derived from סרר, *sarar*, *contumax, vel rebellis fuit*; and that Philo read סדיד, *Sadid*, for סריר, *Sarir*. The *daleth* and *resh* in the Phœnician characters may be yet more easily mistaken for each other than in the Chaldaic.

(54) Vossius derives the name of Rhea from the Hebrew ארץ, *arets, terra*—Mazochi better from the Chaldaic ארע, *area, terra*. But I can find no example from which we can suppose that any Deity was worshipped by the Phœnicians, Syrians, or Chaldeans, under the name of *Arets*, or *Area*. Rhea, as every one knows, was the same with *Terra, Cybele*, the *Magna Mater, Mater Deorum*. Now the author of the Etymologicon says, Ἄμμα, ἡ τροφὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ—καὶ ἡ Ῥέα λέγεται καὶ Ἄμμας καὶ Ἀμμία—*Amma, nurse and mother; and Rhea is called both Ammas and Ammia*. But this appellation of Rhea must have come to the Greeks from the Phœnician or Syrians,

in whose dialects אמה, *amah*, or אמא, *ama*, or *amma*, signifies *mother*. The probability then seems to be that Philo found *Ama*, or *Amma*, in the original, which he rendered by *Rhea*.

(55) I shall have occasion to speak of this name in a subsequent note.

(56) *Εἱμαρμένην καὶ Ὥραν—Fate and Beauty. Heimarmene* is here a personification of Fate, or of the decrees ordained by Fate. I know not how this name may have been expressed in the original, unless it were by חקה, *chukah*, which signifies *statutum, decretum*. It seems not improbable, however, that the Phœnicians may have had a deity named *Chukah*, or *Chukokah*, after whom the Canaanites called one of their cities חקקה, *Chukokah*. (Josh. xix.) Concerning the word εἱμαρμένη the reader may consult the Asclepius attributed to Hermes. (c. 14.)

Hora, hour, season, beauty. We find in Chaldaic שעה, *shah*, and שעתא, *shata*, which may be nearly interpreted in the same manner.

(57) Bochart laughs at the λίθους ἐμψύχους, *animated stones*, of Philo; and adds, *scripserat, credo, Sanchoniathon* אבנים נשפים, *lapides unctos, a radice* שוף, *in ungendi notione apud Syros usitata. Sed* פ *et* ש *transpositis pro* נשפים *scriptum* נפשים. *Unde factum ut lapides uncti mutarentur in animatos*. This is ingenious; but I think Sanchoniatho may have meant to speak of those stones, which are called *rocking stones*, and some of which still

exist in Britain. The Britons were probably taught how to raise and place these stones by the Phœnicians. It might be absurd to call them animated in a literal sense; but this seems to be nothing else than a figurative expression. We might as well cavil at a phrase in use, if I mistake not, among our own *dilettanti*, who, when they admire a fine statue, talk of the living marble.

The remarks of Bochart on the *Bœtylia* are full of that learning which he could pour forth on almost every subject. But after all that has been said, the etymology of the word appears to me to be very plain. Shrines and temples were erected in honour of the Sun. These were called בית־אל, *Bithi-El*, or *Biti-El*, houses, or temples, of *El*; and *El*, as every one knows, was a solar title, given to the Sun by the worshippers of that luminary. But by degrees every place, where the Sun was adored, was called *Bith-El*, or *Beth-El*; and as it was the custom of the heliolaters to raise stones, pillars, and statues, in honour of their God, in the places where they had offered him worship, these came to be also called *Bethi-El*. The worshippers of the true God had probably first adopted this custom, which was followed by the idolaters. The former, when they pronounced the name of *El*, (God,) understood Jehovah; but the latter by the same name understood the Sun, whom they variously called, *El*, *Baal*, *Melech*, *Shemesh*, &c. Jacob meant the House of God, (of Jehovah God,) by *Beth-El*; but the idolaters meant by the same word the

house of their own great deity, the Sun. Now it is to be observed that Jacob says, האבן הזאת אשר־שמתי מצבה יהיה בית אלהים—*this stone which I have placed for a pillar shall be God's house.* But since this Patriarch called the stone which he set up *Beth-Elohim*, we may be pretty certain that the *stones*, *pillars*, and *stelæ*, set up by heliolaters in honor of the Sun, were called *Bethi-El*. Here then I think we have a clear explanation of the origin of the word *bætylia*. Those, however, who would rather derive it from the Greek, may consult the Etymologicon *in voce Βαίτυλος*.

(58) *Ζεὺς Ἀρότριος*. This name might have been בעל חריש, *Baal charish*, in the original.

(59) We have here a repetition of the name of צדיק; the just man, who was probably Noach.

(60) I consider *Esculapius*, or *Asklepios*, to have been originally a solar title. I shall have occasion to speak of the etymology of this name in another note.

(61) Jupiter, Belus, and Apollo. Zeus was the name by which the Greeks generally called the Baal, Beel, or Belus, of the Phœnicians and Syrians; and yet a distinction is made here between Jupiter and Belus. Philo has probably made some mistake. Sanchoniatho may have said that Kronos, whom he may have here called כיון, *Chiun*, had three sons, each of whom, as well as that deity, was named אל, *El*, and בל, *Bel*, and אב־אל, *Ab-El*. These were all solar titles. The last name, *Ab-El*, is com-

posed of *ab, pater,* and *El, Deus;* but by this word the heliolaters generally understood the Sun. D'Herbelot observes that the Sun was frequently called *Ab* by the Oriental idolaters. This solar title of *Ab-El,* which might be also sounded *Ab-Al,* and *Ab-Ol,* was probably that which the Europeans changed into Apollo. Vossius cites the words of Hesychius—'Αβέλιον, ἥλιον, Κρῆτες; and adds, *fortasse Apollo, ex Cretico* 'Αβέλιος.

(62) Hesiod makes Pontus anterior to Kronos. It is difficult to say, however, what could have been the name in the original. The Greeks attempted to derive the name of Pontos from their own language. It appears from the Etymologicon Magnum, that some brought it from πνέω, *flo, flare;* and others from πόνος, *labor.* But this word was evidently of Oriental origin, though it be doubtful whether we can ascertain from what root it sprang. *Pontus,* says the Abbé Mignot, *vient de* בטן, *bethen, qui dans l'Arabe signifie un cours d'eau dans un grand lit.* I have been unable to find this sense of the word. בטן, *bethen,* or *beten,* in Hebrew, and بطن *baten,* or *batn,* in Arabic, signify *venter,* and metaphorically *pars interior rei.* It is to be besides observed, that though the Abbé's derivation of the name of the marine God might be suitable as describing the sea; yet it would by no means answer in accounting, for example, for the name of the kingdom of Pontus.

The name of Typhon is the next which occurs. Thus

Typhon appears to have been a Phœnician as well as an Egyptian deity. The name was probably taken from the Arabians, who call a noxious wind طوفن, *tuphon*. They also denominate a storm of wind and rain طوفان, *tuphan*. The proper sense is a whirlwind; because the root is طوف, *tuph, gyravit, circumivit*. The God of the storm and of the whirlwind was not improperly classed with the God of the sea. The Egyptians made of this God their evil dæmon.

The author of the Etymologicon Magnum derives the name of Nereus ἀπὸ τῆς νήξεως; no doubt because this sea-god was a good swimmer. It might, however, have occurred to this writer, that a Phœnician name was more likely to be derived from the Phœnician than from the Greek. I should think that it came from נהר, *nahar, fluxit*, whence we also have נהר, *nehar, flumen*. Hesiod passes a high eulogium on Nereus, whom he makes the son, and not the father of Pontus.

(63) Bochart derives the name of *Ποσειδῶν*, *Poseidon*, from פשט, *pasat*, which, he says, signifies *dilatare et expandere*. The proper sense of this word is, *to strip, to spoliate*. It also signifies, *to rush forth, to break forth*. It seems to me that the God of the sea received this name as the *breaker forth*. The Greeks had probably so understood it; but as they unhesitatingly derived foreign names from their own language, they varied their explanation of this name from the sense which it originally bore, and maintained that Poseidon signified *Earth-shaker*. Thus the

etymologist says, ἀπὸ τοῦ πέδον, καὶ τοῦ σείω, γίνεται πεδοσίων· καὶ ἐν ὑπερβιβασμῷ, Ποσειδῶν, παρὰ τὸ σείειν τὸ πέδον, κ. τ. λ. —*from pedon* (*humus*) *and seio* (*quatio*) *is produced pedosion, and by transposition poseidon, from shaking the ground, &c.* Still this interpretation has reference to the original sense of the word. It was from the Libyans that the Greeks first obtained this name (Herodot. L. 2.); and the descendants of Phut probably called the God פשט, *Pasat*, or *Past*, or perhaps פושט, *Posat*, as presiding over the waters, which had burst forth from the great abyss, and which had shaken the earth in making their eruption from its cavities. *Ne inter physicas quidem philosophias satis constat*, says Aulus Gellius, *Ventorumne vi accidant, specus, hiatusque, terræ subeuntium; an aquarum subter in terrarum cavis undantium fluctibus: ita uti videntur existimasse antiquissimi Græcorum, qui Neptunum* ἐννοσίγαιον, καὶ σεισίχθονα, *appellaverunt.* But whether Bochart's explanation, or that which I have suggested, be the more accurate, there can be little doubt that the name of Poseidon is derived from פשט. Thus the city in Lucania, which was founded by the Phœnicians, and of which the fine ruins still remain, was called Pæstum by the Latins, and Posidonia by the Greeks. There can be no question that this city was originally called *Pasat*, or *Past*, or *Pæst*, after the name of the god of the sea.

Neptune was another name of the same deity, who appears to have been called *Pasat*, or *Pæst*, by the

Africans, and *Nepat*, or *Nept*, by the Asiatics. Both names were originally given to the sea, and thence to the deity that was supposed to rule over the sea. But as on the shores of Libya this deity was called *Pasat*, or *Pæst*, as the *breaker-forth*, he seems to have been called *Nepat*, *Nept*, or *Nepht*, on the coasts of Phœnice and of Asia Minor, as the *spreader-forth*. This last name is derived from the root נפ, *nep*, or *neph*, to spread forth. The word נפת, *nepat*, or *nephat*, is used in Scripture as signifying an extent, or tract, of country, כל־נפת־דאר, *all the extent* (*region*) *of Dor*. (1 Kings iv. 11.) It is also used to signify a boundary or border. Thus נפות, *nephoth*, is frequently rendered *borders*, in the English version. At ver. 2. c. xi. of the book of Joshua, where this word occurs, Munster says in a note, *exponitur ab Hebræis* נפה, (*naphah*) *pro* מחוז (*machoz*). Now *machoz* signifies *terminus, portus maris;* and, indeed, as far as I recollect, the word נפות, *nephoth*, is never employed, except when mention is made of districts near the sea. Some analogy seems to have existed, as Bochart indicates, between *nephoth* and the name of the Egyptian Goddess *Nephtys*, which is thus interpreted by Plutarch—*Νέφθυν καλοῦσι τῆς γῆς τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ παράλια, καὶ ψαύοντα τῆς θαλάττης—they call the extremities of the land, and promontories, and districts bordering on the sea, nephthys*. It would seem then that the word *nepat*, or *nept*, was a name originally applied to the sea, as presenting a vast expanse to the eye—that the sea coast came to be also denominated from this word—and

that the God of the sea was so called from the name thus given to the element over which he ruled. The Latins appear to have obtained the name of Neptune from the Asiatics. *Nigidius*, says Macrobius, *de Diis libro decimo nono requirit, num Dii Penates sint Trojanorum Apollo et Neptunus, qui muros eis fecisse dicuntur; et num eos in Italiam Æneas advexerit. Cornelius quoque Labeo libro de Diis Penatibus eadem existimat. Hanc opinionem sequitur Maro, cum dicit,*

> *Sic fatus, meritos aris mactabat honores,*
> *Taurum Neptuno, taurum tibi, pulcher Apollo.*

Sanchoniatho, if we can trust to Philo, makes Sidon the son of Pontus, and the brother of Neptune; and Sidon is said to have been the inventor of singing, because he possessed a fine voice. I cannot help thinking that Philo must have misunderstood the original. Perhaps the Phœnician author called Sidon אב־שור, *ab-sur*, for אב־צור, *ab-Tsur;* and wrote the name with an *s*, instead of *ts*. The Arabians certainly write *Sur*, instead of *Tsur;* and the Phœnicians may have done the same thing. This orthography, however, may have deceived Philo; who may have thought that שור, *sur*, was written for שיר, *sir, cantus, cantilena, carmen*. We find examples even in Hebrew where *sur* is written for *sir, cantus*, as at 1 Sam. xviii. 6. The word *ab*, which properly signifies father, also signifies author, inventor. It may be presumed then hat Sanchoniatho did not call Sidon the inventor of song,

but the father of *Sur*, or *Tsur*, which we call Tyre. Isaiah calls Tyre the daughter of Sidon.

(64) Melkarthus has been understood by some as equivalent to מלך־ארץ, *Melech-arets, rex terræ.* Bochart prefers מלך־קרתא, *Melech-karta, rex urbis.* Selden reads מלך־עריץ, *Melech-arits, rex robustus, prævalidus.* Melkarthus, or Hercules, was worshipped at Tyre from the most remote antiquity. (Herodot. L. 2.)

Heracles, or Hercules, was no other than a solar title. The Phœnicians seem to have adored the Sun under the names of אור־כול, *Aur-cul*, and חר־כול, *Her-cul;* which signified the light and heat of the universe—*universal light —universal heat.* To these we may add, אש־כול, *Esh-cul, ignis universus, the universal fire,* whence proceed the light and heat, which illumine and warm the world.

Neither does it appear to me that Asklepios, or Esculapius, was any other than *Hercul*, or *Es-cul*, distinguished by a particular symbol. The Marchese Venuti pretends that *Escul*, or *Hescul*, was the name by which Hercules was first known in Italy. *In quei tempi antichissimi*, says he, *tanto valeva l'r che l's, anzi pochissimo, o nulla si servivano dell'r; come Fusius, in vece di Furius, Valesius di Valerius: dunque si puo dedurre che pronunciassero Hescules, e che questa fusse la denominazione più antica.* I should think it more likely, that the deity in question being called sometimes *Hercul*, and sometimes *Escul*, by the Asiatics, the Latins might have varied the name in the

same manner. We have, however, no proof of this having been the case; nor, as far as I know, did the Latins ever write Hescules for Hercules.

Asklepios, or Esculapius, was no other than the Sun worshipped as the source of health, and as the preserver of life. Macrobius describes Æsculapius to be *vis salubris de substantia solis subveniens animis corporibusque mortalium.* Accordingly he was feigned by the poets to be the son of Apollo. But there can be no question that the mythologists considered Æsculapius as the Sun. Pausanias says that the image of this God was called the image of health; and adds, καὶ παιδὶ εἶναι δῆλα, ὡς τὸν ἡλιακὸν δρόμον ἐπὶ γῆς ὑγείαν ποιοῦντα ἀνθρώποις—*and it is manifest even to a child, that the Sun's course round the earth causes health to mortals.* It would appear then that Asklepios, or Æsculapius, was the same as *Aur-cul, Hercul,* or *Escul,* distinguished by a particular quality, or attribute. The Greeks, with their usual veracity, represented Asklepios as a Grecian deity, and as the God of Epidaurus. They pretended that his original name was Ἤπιος, *Epios.* Thus Lycophron says,

Ἀρωγὸν αἰδήσωσιν Ἠπίου γόνον
Ἀστοῖσι καὶ πολίναισι πρευμενῆ μολεῖν.

They implore the auxiliary offspring of Epios to come with mildness to the citizens and flocks. Tzetzes tells us that Asklepios was originally called Epios, but that having cured Askles, King of Epidaurus, he was afterwards named

Asklepios. It may seem, however, more probable, that *epios*, which signifies *clemens, mitis*, was an epithet which the Greeks originally gave to *Escul*, the Sun, considered as the preserver of health. But as Sanchoniatho, who flourished before the Trojan war, assigns a far more remote date than the time in which he himself lived to Asklepios, we may suspect that the Greeks gave the epithet of *epios* to Escul, as the substitute of some Phœnician word, which was often or always associated with the name of Escul, when adored as the God of health. A serpent was the peculiar symbol of Æsculapius; and the word אפעה, *apah*, or *epah*, (frequently written אפא, *apa*, or *epa*, or *epe*, in the Talmud,) signifies a viper, a basilisk, a serpent. This word may have been often conjoined with that of *Escul*, when the Sun was adored as influencing the health of mortals; and the Greeks, though they still represented the *apa*, or *epe*, or serpent, as the companion of the God, may have altered the Oriental name into a word in their own language.

(66) *Astarte, surnamed the greatest.* Philo probably found עשתרות הגדולה, *Ashteroth hagedolah*, in the original. This Goddess was generally considered as the Moon; but Suidas says that the planet Venus was named Astarte. The same Goddess, however, might preside over the moon and over the star of evening. Thus in Egypt Isis was considered as the moon; and the evening star

was called the star of Isis. (Diodor. Sicul. L. 1. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. Plin. L. 2. c. 8.) According to Philo, Astarte was the same as Venus; and Cicero (de Nat. Deor. L. 3.) says she was the fourth of that name.

The word *ashteroth*, or *asteroth*, is generally understood to signify *flocks*. This may truly appear a very strange name for a goddess. The Greeks, who altered Asteroth into Astarte, would have it to signify a star. But this notion is untenable for a moment. We must endeavour to account for the name in another manner.

As the Tsabaists addressed their worship to the צבאות, *tsabaoth*, the celestial hosts, they of course paid much attention to the motions and positions of the Sun and Moon and planets. The divisions of the zodiac, as I have proved in my Essay on the Monuments of Esneh and Denderah, were known to the Egyptians and Orientalists from a very remote æra; nor were they ignorant, as I have likewise shown, of the apparent motion of the stars in longitude. That they had calculated the period in which a complete sideral revolution is effected is equally clear, since they had divided the great circle, the ecliptic, into 360 degrees, and the zodiac into 12 signs, and into 72 dodecans. But 72 years is the period in which the Sun retrogrades a degree. Consequently 360 years multiplied by 72 will give 25,920 years, the period in which the pole of the equator turns round the pole of the ecliptic, and

gives to the starry heavens the appearance of an entire revolution round the earth, while in fact it is only this globe itself which has changed its position with respect to the stars. Now at the epoch of the deluge, and for several centuries after that event, according to the chronology of the LXX, the Sun at the vernal equinox, reckoning by the real zodiac, was in the constellation of Taurus. Following the same chronology, the Sun at the vernal equinox retrograded into the constellation of Aries, rather more than six centuries after the deluge, about 4320 years before the present time, supposing the Sun to be now just entering the 30th degree of Aquarius at the vernal equinox, and always reckoning according to the real zodiac. The equinoctial Sun passed from Aries into Pisces rather more than three centuries before the Christian æra. Thus from the time of the deluge, until within about 335 years before Christ, the Sun had been first rather more than 630 years in the constellation of Taurus, and afterwards 2160 years in the constellation of Aries, at the vernal equinox. It follows that the Tsabaists first considered Taurus, and afterwards Aries, as the leading constellation. The emblems of these two constellations, the Bull and the Ram, were therefore held in peculiar veneration by heliolaters, who generally typified the Sun by these animals. The constellations, in the language of mythological allegory, were compared to herds and flocks, of which the Bull and the Ram were the

leaders; and the Sun, in the same language, soon became identified with the animals, which were the emblems of the constellations, in which, during a long succession of ages, he had risen from the lower to the upper hemisphere. The Egyptians, at a very remote æra, represented the equinoctial Sun in Taurus by Osiris. Diodorus Siculus plainly says (L. 1.) that Osiris was the Sun; and he afterwards tells us that the soul of that deity migrated into the body of Apis. According to Strabo this bull was no other than Osiris, who was the Sun.—Memphis, says he, contains a temple τοῦ Ἄπιδος, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ Ὄσιρις —of Apis, who is the same as Osiris. Macrobius has truly said, *taurum vero ad solem referri, multiplici ratione Ægyptius cultus ostendit.* Ammon was the representative of the equinoctial Sun in Aries. Jablonski (L. 2. c. 2.) quotes a passage from Proclus, which he thus renders—*Arietem Ægyptii singularem in modum coluerunt, eo quod simulacro Ammonis apud ipsos caput arietinum imponatur. Accedit, quod Aries, primum quippe zodiaci signum, principium sit genituræ, et quod motus ejus est velocissimus, quia in illo signo Sol æquinoctium fecit.* The heliolaters of Phœnice, Syria, and Chaldea, appear to have worshipped the Sun under the forms of bulls and rams for the same reasons.

But the Moon, the *Melecheth Hashamaim*, the Queen of heaven, was worshipped as the spouse of the Sun. It

was particularly to the Moon, after her conjunction with the Sun at the vernal equinox, that divine honours were paid by idolaters. All the mythologists attest that Apis was sacred to Isis, or the Moon. The bull of Memphis appears therefore to have been originally intended as a type of the Sun and Moon in cônjunction in the constellation of Taurus. Porphyry indeed says, that the Egyptians dedicated the bull, which they called Apis, to the Moon, and which was black above all others, and bore the marks, or symbols (σημεῖα) of the Sun and Moon, because the light of the Moon is from the Sun. But, as I have just said, it seems more probable to me that the Apis, bearing the symbols of the two luminaries, was the type of their conjunction in the constellation of Taurus at the vernal equinox.

Now to return to *ashteroth*, or *asteroth*. I observe that this word, when not employed as a proper name, and when translated ποίμνια, *greges, flocks*, in the versions, is always joined with צאן, *tsan*, or *tsoan, sheep*. But עשתרות is evidently a compound word, composed, as it seems to me, of עש, *ash*, or עוש, *aosh*, an assemblage, and תרות, *teroth*, or *toroth*, which word bears various meanings, and seems to signify here ranks, successions, companies. Consequently *asteroth tsan* literally signifies an assemblage of successions, or companies, of sheep. But Ashteroth, or Asteroth, considered as the name of the Tsidonian goddess, probably bore a different meaning. Lucian

says, Ἀστάρτην δ' ἐγω δοκέω σεληναίην ἔμμεναι—*I think Astarte is the Moon itself.* Now I understand עשתרות, *Ashteroth,* the name of the goddess, to be composed of עשה, *ashah,* or עשוה, *ashoh,* abbreviated here into עש, *ash,* and תרות, *teroth,* or *toroth;* and I interpret this name—maker of circuits, or, in one word, revolver. This name therefore applies well to the Phœnician deity, considered as the representative of the Moon. But see more in note 68.

(67) *Adodos,* or *Adod,* was probably the same with the Assyrian god called *Adad* by Macrobius. *Deo quem summum,* says this writer, *maximumque venerantur Assyrii, Adad nomen dederunt. Ejus nominis interpretatio significat unus.* The original name was probably אחד־אחד, *achad-achad,* a reduplication which would signify *the One* κατ' ἐξοχήν. But it may be asked, how this name came to be written Ἄδωδος in Greek, and *Adad* in Roman characters. The Greek termination is of course to be thrown aside: it is of no consequence how the radical letters were supplied with vowels, and the Greeks and Latins were in the frequent habit of suppressing the harsh aspirate of the Orientalists. Thus they wrote Noë for Noach, Eva for Chevah, &c. Consequently they might easily have pronounced and written *Ad-od,* or *Ad-ad,* for *Achad-achad.*

(68) *Astarte placed on her own head the head of a bull, as the symbol of royalty.* Isis was also represented as

ταυροκέρως, bearing on her head the horns of a bull or ox. Herodotus says, Ἶσιος ἄγαλμα, ἐὸν γυναικήϊον, βούκερών ἐστι —*the image of Isis has the form of a woman, with the horns of an ox.* Kimchi assures us that, according to the Rabbin, the images of Asteroth were made בצורת הצאן, in the form of sheep. Again, it is said in the book of Tobit, that the idolaters in Galilee, a province bordering on Phœnicia, sacrificed τῇ Βαὰλ, τῇ δαμάλει, to the female Baal, the heifer. This female Baal was probably Asteroth, the Queen of heaven. Mention is made in Scripture of a city called Ashteroth-Karnaim, Asteroth of horns, or the horned Asteroth; and the city was apparently named after the goddess.

It appears to me that Asteroth was thus variously designated as the representative of the Moon at the vernal equinox. When the equinoctial Sun was in the constellation of Taurus, the goddess was represented as assuming the head and horns of a bull; and when the Sun retrograded at the same season into the constellation of Aries, Asteroth was feigned to have taken the form of a sheep.

Cicero enumerates four goddesses who were called Venus; and of the last he says, *quarta Syria, Tyroque concepta, quæ Astarthe vocatur, quam Adonidi nupsisse traditum est.* Now Macrobius gives us the following account of the same Venus—*Simulacrum hujus Deæ in monte Libano fingitur capite obnupto, specie tristi, faciem manu læva intra amictum sustinens, lacrymæ visione*

conspicientium manare creduntur. Quæ imago, præterquam quod lugentis est (diximus) deæ, terræ quoque hyemalis est, quo tempore obnupta nubibus, sole vidua stupet; fontesque, velut i terræ oculi, uberius manant; agrique iterum suo cultu vidui, mœstam faciem sui monstrant. Sed cum emerserit ab inferioribus terræ, juvenalisque æquinoctii transgreditur fines augendo diem; tunc et Venus læta, et pulchra vivent arva segetibus, prata herbis, arbores foliis. Ideo majores nostri Aprilem mensem Veneri dicaverunt.

Thus the Syrian Venus, or Asteroth, put on a new face after the vernal equinox. Macrobius indeed evidently considered this goddess as the personification of Nature, in the passage which I have just quoted from him, and represents her as the terrestrial Venus. But Asteroth was also worshipped as the Moon, and as the celestial Venus. Pausanias, when clearly speaking of Astarte, and of a temple which was built in her honour in Attica, says, πλησίον δὲ, ἱερόν ἐστιν Ἀφροδίτης Οὐρανίας—*near is a temple of celestial Venus.* The words of Macrobius, however, authorise us to conclude that the Venus of Mount Libanon, or Astarte, was worshipped with peculiar solemnity at the season of the vernal equinox, and that there was an idol of the goddess presented to her adorers on that occasion, which differed from that which was exhibited to them during the winter months.

But I have little doubt that Asteroth was principally worshipped as the representative of the new Moon, after

the vernal equinox. The consecration of the new Moon was a rite religiously observed by various Oriental nations; and this ceremony was probably attended with peculiar pomp at the season which I have just mentioned.

The Phœnicians, the great merchants, navigators, and travellers, of the ancient world, have left traces of their religion in many countries far remote from their own. We have seen, in the first volume of this work, how the name and worship of Baal were extended from India to Britain, apparently by means of the Phœnicians. The ancient Germans, after the example of the same people, seem to have worshipped the Moon, at the vernal equinox, under the name of *Æstar*, or *Easter;* and this name may be thought to be derived from that of the goddess of the Tsidonians. *Tacitus*, says Bochart, *ad Astartes Deæ Phœnicum nomen alludit Æstar, vel Easter. Ea fuit Dea Saxonum cui mense Aprili sacrificarunt. Unde Aprilem mensem vocarunt Easter monath, ut scribit Beda in libro de temporibus. Quin hodieque Angli Paschales ferias appellant Easter time.* (See note 72.)

(69) For ἀστέρα read ἀστερίαν. See Bochart, p. 787.

(70) I suspect this passage to be an interpolation.

(71) *His name was Mouth.* מות, *muth*, signifies *death.*

(72) *Baaltis, who is the same with Dione.* The name of Baaltis was evidently בעלתי, *Baalti*, in the original, and signifies *Domina—Domina mea.* The Tsabeans

adored this goddess, of whom frequent mention is made by Arabian authors. Thus in the book of Muhammed Ben Isaac, from which long extracts have been made by Hottinger, the name of بلتي, *Balti* or *Belti* often occurs; though it will be observed that, according to the orthography of the Arabians, the *oin*, or *ain*, is omitted. But the orthography of the Chaldeans authorises this omission since they wrote בל, *Bel*, for בעל, *Baal*.

On the three first days, and on the sixth day of the first month, which commenced with the first new Moon after the vernal equinox, the worshippers of *Belti* were accustomed to frequent her temples, and to offer sacrifices in her honour. Muhammed says that upon the fourth day of the ninth month, ينصبون قبة يسمونها الخضم ابلتي *tabernaculum erigunt, thalamum seu cubile Belthæ.* I would rather, with all due deference to Hottinger, render these words—*tabernaculum ponunt, quod viride appellant, Belthæ.* This tent, or tabernacle, was ornamented with branches, fruits and flowers. It is said of Josias (2 Kings xxiii.), *destruxit quoque ædiculas effœminatorum, quæ erant in domo Domini, pro quibus mulieres texebant quasi domunculas luci.* It may be questioned whether the words בתים לאשרה be properly translated *domunculas luci.* It rather seems to me that by *asharah* in this place was meant an idol, or at least an emblem, of the Sun; and that the verse ought to be rendered, *diruit quoque ædiculas effœminatorum in domo Domini, quas*

ædiculas mulieres ibi texebant pro Asarah. I have not ventured to translate בתים, by curtains, as the Rabbin seem here to understand the word; because the *domunculæ*, as Jerom calls them, rather appear to me to have been formed of branches of trees interwoven, and to have been small arbours in which the idols were placed. The word אשרה undoubtedly signifies a grove; but I would rather understand it here as designating the deity to whom the arbours, or small groves, were dedicated. This seems to be the interpretation which Kimchi has given to the words in question, with the exception of בתים, which he renders *cortinæ*. He adds, that the women sitting there *sollicite quærebant et expectabant Asaram.* The deity therefore adored in these groves was no other than the Sun—Adonis, Thammuz, Osiris. Now I imagine that the green tabernacles of *Belti*, adorned with branches, fruits, and flowers, were similar to the *domunculæ*, which were destroyed by Josias. These arbours were dedicated to *Belti*, or Venus, who during the winter months mourned for the death of Adonis, and who, sitting in her green tabernacle, or arbour, anxiously awaited his return.

Belti was the same with Venus. According to Ali Said Vaheb, ebn Ibrahim, the sixth day of the week was sacred to *Belti*. This goddess was therefore the Tsabean Venus. But Sanchoniatho says that *Baaltis* was the same with Dine; and Dione, as every one knows,

was the same with Venus. The evening star was accordingly called the star of Dione. It has been supposed by some, and even by Servius, that when Virgil wrote,

Ecce Dionæi processit Cæsaris astrum,

he alluded to the star which was said to have appeared at the death of Julius Cæsar. I rather think he meant to indicate the planet Venus, at the season when it becomes an evening star. Cæsar, as descended from Venus through Æneas, is called Dionæus, and the planet Venus is named by the poet the star of Cæsar Dionæus.

Belti, Domina, was one of the titles given by the Tsabaists to Asteroth; for it is evident that Asteroth, who was Aphrodite, must have been the same as Belti, who was Dione. Both represented the evening star, and both were personifications of the Moon, particularly of the new Moon, after the vernal equinox.

(73) The reader may see what I have said on this subject in the second volume.

(74) I have likewise spoken of this passage in the second volume.

(75) Hellanicus Lesbius says that the priests pronounced Ὄσιρις, and not Osiris.

(76) Concerning these three letters I refer my readers to the very ingenious writer, who in decyphering many of the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Egyptians, has lifted

at least a corner of the veil of Isis. M. Champollion has promised to give an explanation of this passage.

(77) See this passage examined in a former chapter.

(78) The whole of this paragraph is to be ascribed to Philo, or to Eusebius, and not to Sanchoniatho.

PREVIOUS NOTICE.

BEFORE I proceed to speak of the origin of the Arabians, I wish to make a very few remarks on the orthography, which I shall employ in writing Oriental names in Roman characters. Upon this subject there exists a great diversity of opinion. My object here is not to attack others, but to defend myself.

European writers differ chiefly about the powers to be given to the following Arabic letters, ث ج خ ذ ض ظ غ ف ق ك ي.

1. The French, almost invariably, express the letter ث by *ts*. Some English authors denote it by an *s*. I think it should be sounded like the Greek θ, or the English *th*; but *ts* is at any rate nearer the sound than *s*.

2. ج answers to *g* soft. When it precedes the vowels *a*, *o*, or *u*, or when it terminates a word, it must be expressed by the letter *j*. The

French, who pronounce *g* soft, and *j* very differently from the English, are obliged to write *dg*, or *dj*, in order to give the sound required. But the Arabic letter in question properly answers to the letter *g*.

3. ج has precisely the same sound as the Hebrew ח, and the German *ch*. The French represent it by *kh*. I generally employ *ch* hard for this purpose. English writers have frequently supplied the harsh aspirate in writing Hebrew and Arabic names by the soft. Thus they write *Noah* for *Noach*, when the original word נח leaves no doubt that the latter is the proper manner of writing the name. Other nations have gone still further, and have supplied the harsh aspirate by an open vowel. Thus the French write *Noë*, which bears as much resemblance to the real name, as *Tite Live* does to *Titus Livius*.

4. The letter ذ is variously expressed by different writers—*dh*, *ds*, and *dz*. Some even write *d*, because they say this is the vulgar pronunciation. But the vulgar pronunciation is not exactly the best authority. I generally express ذ by *ds*.

5. ض is pronounced *dh* by some, *dz* by others. It should be remembered that without the diacritical point ص is sounded *s*. How then with that point does it become *dh?* I find besides that this letter answers to the Hebrew צ *tsade*. I therefore express it by *ds*, or *ts;* but most frequently by the last.

6. The letter ط is sounded *t;* I therefore express ظ by *ts*, or by *tz*.

7. Most writers are agreed in giving to غ the sound of *g* hard. Others, however, would have us to express it by *rh*. How in this case should we connect it with the Hebrew ע, or the Arabic ع?

8. It appears to me that the letter ف should be represented by *ph* rather than by *f*. The Persians call one of their ancient monarchs *Gustasph*—the Arabians name the same Prince *Istasph*, or *Yestasph*. We should hardly guess that they meant the monarch whom the Greeks called Darius Hystaspes, if the name were written *Gustasf*, *Istasf*, or *Yestasf*.

9. I express the letter ق, as well as the letter ك, by *k;* but it would perhaps be better to re-

present the former by *q*. The French have very generally adopted this orthography.

10. ي when preceding a vowel ought to be expressed by *y;* but the Germans, and even the English, frequently represent this letter by a *j*. Where it precedes a consonant it may be represented by the vowel *i*.

With regard to the manner in which ancient Arabic names are to be supplied by vowels, it seems to me that all attempts to come to any decision are entirely vain. How can we know how names, which existed a thousand years before a *phathah*, or a *kesrah*, or a *dsammah*, was imagined, are to be furnished with those signs? How shall we venture to say; here ought to be a *hamza;* there a *gesm;* and there a *teshdid?* We appeal to the Arabians; but what can they know more than ourselves of the mode of pronouncing names which existed ages before their present alphabet was invented? Besides, the Europeans, the most conversant with Arabic literature, are not agreed about the decisions of the Arabians. Take the name of حمير for example. I could cite great authorities for each

of the following modes in which it is written in Roman characters—*Hamjar*, *Himyar*, *Homeir*.

But there is yet another consideration. Few manuscripts, and yet fewer printed books, contain the vowel marks. Besides, if we had them, we should still be often uncertain what sounds to give them, since *phathah* may be sounded either *a* or *e*—*kesrah* either *e* or *i*—and *dsammah* either *o* or *u*. Then, as I have already said, who is to tell us how ancient names were pronounced three thousand years ago? When we speak of the ancient city of مارب, for example, it would be a mere waste of time to dispute, whether its inhabitants of old called it Marab, or Mareb, or Marib, or Maarib. The modern Arabians may prefer one of these modes of pronunciation to the rest; but they have no written documents prior to the time of Mahomet; and as they had no vowel marks until long after the time of their Prophet, it is not likely that they should have very accurately preserved the exact articulation of their forefathers, centuries before their present alphabet existed. I believe that no nation on earth has

retained the sounds of words unchanged during the lapse of a thousand years. The Arabians have no doubt taken infinite pains in writing manuscripts of the Koran with all the marks and signs, which they invented chiefly to preserve the proper pronunciation of the language of that book. But he must have more faith than I have, who believes that any modern Arabian employs exactly the same sounds and accents in reading the Koran, as its author would do, if he could again revisit the earth, and repeat those *surats*, of which the wild eloquence has for nearly twelve centuries infatuated half the nations of the East.

ARABIA
ANTIQUA
Millaria Romana.
MARE
INTERNUM
ARABIA PETREA
ARABIA Themi
Thamydeni
Thamudite
PERSIS
CARMANIA
GEDROSIA
Arene Ichthyophagi
Araretici
DESERTA
Negrana
Sacalite
Thuriféra Regio
Sacalitæ Sinus
Dioscoridis Ins.
ÆGYPTUM
ÆTHIOPIA
SEBRIDA
HOMERITÆ
SABÆA
ERYTHRÆUM
MARE
Nilus R.
Longitude East from Ferro.

ORIGINES.

BOOK VI.

ARABIA.

CHAPTER I.

Containing a few cursory remarks on the geographical situation of Arabia.

The peninsula of Arabia, says Niebuhr, *is bounded on the west by the gulph of that name, otherwise called the Red sea; on the south and on the east by the ocean; and on the north-east by the Persian gulph. A straight line*, continues the same author, *drawn from the Persian gulph to the extremity of the Arabian gulph, probably marked its northern boundary in ancient times; but at present all Arak Arabi, the Syrian desert, and Palestine, may be reckoned as forming a part of this country, which consequently is contiguous towards the north with the Euphrates and Syria, and towards*

the west with Egypt, by the isthmus which joins Africa and Asia.

The celebrated traveller, from whom I have cited the passage above, appears to me to have been led into a great error when he supposed that a straight line, drawn between the extremities of the Persian and Arabian gulphs, ever formed the northern boundary of Arabia. Such a line would nearly correspond with the parallel of thirty degrees of northern latitude; but this line is merely imaginary; and has never been the limit of the Arabian territory. It may indeed be supposed to form the northern boundary of the country, when described as a peninsula, and when denominated, as it is by Abulfeda, جزيرة العرب, *Gezirah al Arab.* But Arabia cannot be strictly and accurately designated as a peninsula; nor is there any reason to suppose that its limits to the north were ever greatly different from what they are at the present day. The name of Arabia, or Arab, عرب, which signifies *the west*, was originally given by the Chaldeans to the country which lies to the west of the Euphrates, and conse-

quently to the north of the line, which Niebuhr fancied to have been the ancient northern boundary of Arabia. This boundary, which on the side of Syria extends nearly to the thirty-fourth degree of northern latitude, has always been winding and sinuous. Running in an easterly direction from the desert of Sur, it passes by the southern shore of the Dead sea, then proceeding towards the north-east, it extends nearly as far as Palmyra, and after skirting the Syrian mountains, bends towards the Euphrates, follows the course of that stream for nearly twenty leagues, and then leaves the hills of Arak, or Irak Arabi and the Persian gulph to form the eastern limit of the Arabian territory.

Oriental writers are not agreed either about the names, or about the extent, of the provinces into which Arabia is divided. According to Al Madaini, cited by Abubeker, this country contains five provinces—*Tchamah*, *Neged*, *Hejaz*, *Arud*, or *Aruds*, and *Yemen*. The divisions of Arabia named by Ibn Haukal are—*Hejaz*, *Neged al Hejaz*, *Badiah al Arak*, *Badiah al Gezirah*, *Ba-*

diah al Sham, and *Yemen*. Edrisi makes the following division—*Tehamah*, *Yemen*, *Hadramaut Mahrah*, *Shegr*, *Oman*, *Bahrain*, *Neged*, *Yamama*, and *Hejaz*. Only four provinces are reckoned by Ulugh Beg—*Yemen*, *Oman*, *Hejaz*, and *Bahrain*.

The Arabians seem to be unacquainted with the partition, which was made of their country by the Greeks and Romans, into *Petræa*, *Deserta*, and *Felix*. Neither is it easy to decide what were the exact limits assigned by the classical authors themselves to these divisions of Arabia. I shall however endeavour to give a general account of the three regions, without attempting to enter into minute details, which I would rather leave to the care of professed geographers.

1. Arabia Petræa was so named from the city Petra. Its boundary on the west and on the north extended along the shore of the bay of Suez, included the desert of Sur, passed by the Dead sea, and thence, taking a north-easterly direction, reached as far as the mountains of Chermon, חרמון. This country was bounded on the

south and on the east by the Arabian gulph, the Elanitic bay, and the desert. Arabia Petræa contained various districts, of which the most ancient inhabitants are chiefly known to us from the accounts which are given of them in the sacred Scriptures.

Of all this country no part is so interesting as that which lies between the two bays, now called BAHR EL KOLZUM, and BAHR EL AKABA. Niebuhr says that this small region is denominated *Bar el tur Sina*, which I should write in Arabic characters بر الطور سينا, and which signifies the country of Mount Sina. But though the district be small, it was the scene of some of the most extraordinary events which have occurred in the history of the world; and this region of miracles is still surveyed with equal curiosity and respect by the Jew, the Christian, and the Mussulman. If indeed great events can attach importance to the places where they have happened, there are few localities which ought to excite more interest, or inspire greater veneration, than the country which received the Israelites after their miraculous passage through

the Red sea, and which contains the holy mountains of Horeb and Sinai.

The bay of Suez is now called بحر القلزم, *Bahr el Kolzum*, by the Arabians. Bochart thinks with reason that the city called Kolsum was the Klysma of the Greeks. The Greeks denominated the bay the Heroopolite, from the city of Heroopolis which was situate on the coast. (Strabo L. 16. Ptol. L. 5.)

The inlet, called the *Bahr el Akaba* by the modern Arabians, was named the Alaïnite, Elanite, or Elanitic bay by the Greeks and Romans. Diodorus Siculus (L. 3. s. 43.) writes κόλπος Ἀλαϊνίτης; and Pliny, *Ælaniticus sinus*. (L. 5.) The bay was thus named from a city which was situated on its western shore, and which Ptolemy calls Ἔλανα, *Elana*, and Stephanus Αἴλανα, *Aïlana*. But Strabo (L. 16.) writes the name Ἄειλα, *Aeila*; and it is probable that this city is the same which is mentioned in Scripture by the name of *Ailath* (אילת).

The city of Akaba is placed at the extremity of the bay to which it now gives its name. Akaba probably stands on the site of one of

the cities called Berenice; and this city of Berenice, as we learn from Josephus, (Antiq. Jud. L. 8.) was no other than that called *Atsion Gaber* (עציון גבר) in the sacred writings.

To the east of the Elanitic bay lay the country of the Madianites. Their metropolis was called Madian after the son of Abraham by Keturah. Another city of the name of Madian was situate near to the river Arnon, and was probably inhabited by one of the tribes of the Madianites.

The country of the Amalekites was separated from that of the Madianites by the desert of Sin.

The land of Edom, called Idumæa by the Greeks, was originally possessed by the Chori (חרי), who were driven from their ancient habitations by the descendants of Esau. It is difficult to ascertain what were the limits of Idumæa. According to some writers, the cities of Botsrah, Dedan, and Petra, were included in this territory.

Cellarius considers the districts inhabited by the Moabites and Ammonites, and which ex-

tended from south to north between the rivers Zared and Jabok, as having formed a part of Arabia Petræa. It would seem at first sight that the mountains of Chermon and Galaad ought to have formed the natural boundary between Arabia and Palestine. Cellarius, however, observes that *Rabbath Ammon* was the principal city of the Ammonites; and he cites the words of Polybius, who calls it Ῥαβατάμανα τῆς Ἀραβίας. This city was afterwards called Philadelphia in honour of Ptolemy Philadelphus; but Stephanus, who gives us this information, says that the country in which it was situated was Cœle-Syria. On the other hand we find it reckoned as an Arabian city by Eusebius and Jerom, who are thus agreed with Polybius.

Frequent mention is made by the Greek and Roman writers of the Nabatæi; but it is not easy to ascertain to what part of Arabia they belonged. According to Strabo, (L. 16.) Petra was a city of the Nabatæi, who consequently must have had possessions near to the Red sea. This fact is indeed affirmed by Diodorus Siculus, (L. 3.) who says that the Aïlanite bay

was environed by many villages belonging to the Nabatæi. But the same historian had before stated (L. 2.) that the Nabatæi inhabited the eastern side of Arabia. In apparent contradiction to all these statements Stephanus says, *Ναβαταῖοι—ἔθνος τῶν εὐδαιμόνων Ἀράβων*, the Nabatæi are a nation of Arabia Felix.

These accounts seem to be contradictory, but they are perhaps not altogether irreconcileable. The sacred historian (Gen. xxv.) tells us that Ishmael dwelt from Hevila even to Sur. Hevila was situate on the Persian gulph. The desert of Sur, which formed part of the isthmus between Asia and Egypt, lay about a degree and a half further north than Hevila; but the distance in longitude between these places amounted to nearly 300 leagues. It appears from different passages in Scripture, that the Ishmaelites were rich in flocks and herds, that they dwelt in tents, and that consequently they frequently changed their habitations. The Nabatæi sprang from Nabaioth, the first-born of Ishmael; and their name may have been often assumed for that of the Ishmaelites, of which race they formed

the principal and most distinguished tribe. Jerom (Quæst. in Genes.) says that from Nabaioth, all the region from the Euphrates to the Red sea was called Nabatena. Thus the Nabatæi, as the representatives of all the Ishmaelites, are mentioned as inhabiting different parts of Arabia; but the country which really belonged to their tribe was probably situated between the Elanitic bay and the mountains of Seir.

2. Arabia Deserta, according to Ptolemy, (L. 5. c. 19.) was bounded on the west by parts of Syria and Arabia Petræa; on the north by a part of Mesopotamia and the Euphrates; on the east by Chaldea; and on the south by Arabia Felix.

Although Ptolemy has styled this region ἡ ἔρημος Ἀραβία, yet there are many parts of it which are by no means so sterile as this denomination might lead us to suppose. Niebuhr says that the mountainous parts of this country are very fertile. There is however a scarcity of water; and the want of irrigation renders the soil less productive than it would otherwise be. But the less elevated parts of the country, par-

ticularly towards Syria and Babylonia, are entirely sterile; and it was perhaps from hearing of the *Badiah al Sham*, otherwise called the Syrian desert, that Ptolemy gave the name of Arabia Deserta to the whole region between Syria and Arabia Felix. The sandy plains which lie to the west of the mountains of Arak Arabi are likewise totally barren. This country is denominated *Badiah al Arak*—the desert of Arak; and it was probably on account of the sterility of the soil of the region called ערב, *Arab*, which was originally so named because it lay to the west of Chaldea, that the word Arab, or Arabah, came also to signify a desert in Chaldaic and Hebrew.

Almost the whole of Arabia Petræa must have fallen within the vast districts now called نجد, *Neged*, and هجر بحرين, *Hajar Bahrin*. It is indeed not very easy to know the precise limits of these districts. The name of *neged*, taken according to its strict meaning, seems only applicable to a mountainous country; and *hajar bahrin* might be supposed to indicate the whole of Arabia which is situated between the

Red sea and the Persian gulph. With regard to the first of these names it will be found, that according to its meaning it is applied to different regions; but it properly seems to belong to the countries situated between Tehamah and Yemen, and between Al Arak and Al Sham. The words of Abulfeda are as follows— نجد الفلصلة بين اليمن وتهامه وبين العراق الشام, *Neged which interposes between Yemen and Tehamah, and between Al Arak and Al Sham.* Hajar Bahrin is so denominated from being situate between a lake, near Ahsa in the desert, and the salt sea, a name sometimes given to the Persian gulph. But it is said in the Mosh-tarik that Hajar is used as a general name to signify the whole country of Bahrin. Abulfeda places Bahrin in the district of Neged; and yet this statement seems contradictory to that which has been cited above. Be this however as it may, the modern Arabians seem to reckon all the eastern part of the peninsula, to the north of Oman, as belonging to Bahrin. This region is otherwise called الحسا, *El Hasa.* It likewise appears that the modern Arabians understand

by Neged the whole region between El Hasa and Hejas, and between Yemen and Syria. Thus we cannot be far wrong in stating Arabia Deserta to have been comprised in the districts of Neged and Hajar Bahrin.

The present inhabitants of Neged and Bahrin are probably descendants of the Ishmaelites. I have however been unable, with only two or three exceptions, to trace the modern names of their cities to those which are mentioned in the writings of the ancients. Perhaps the district called الروضة, *Alrodsah*, pronounced *Arrodsah*, or *Arrodah*, is the same with the *Arrade* of Ptolemy. The Salma of this writer may be the same with the modern سلمية, *Salmiah*. *Phaid* may, as Busching thinks, have been the same city which Pliny calls *Phoda*. Busching observes that the city of *Duma* was probably first named after Duma, one of the sons of Ishmael.

3. Let us now turn our attention towards Arabia Felix. Strabo (L. 1.) remarks that of all countries this is the only one which is called the happy; and there are certainly some parts of this extensive region which deserve the epi-

thet. Thus among the hills and valleys of Yemen, where the climate is rendered temperate by the elevation of the soil above the level of the sea, Nature has been prodigal of all her bounties. This is the land of frankincense and myrrh. The country abounds with fruits and flowers and odoriferous shrubs. The mountains are covered with date-trees, that exclude the rays of a tropical sun; and perennial streams glide along the cultivated valleys, which irrigation renders always verdant. The environs of Sana are celebrated for their amenity; and the gardens of this metropolis of Yemen have been compared to the gardens of Damascus. Some other provinces of Arabia Felix likewise enjoy the blessings of a temperate climate and a fruitful soil. Fertile spots may be found in Oman, and in the districts of Joph and Japha; but these fortunate regions are small indeed when compared with the remainder of the vast and desert territory which has yet been denominated Arabia Felix; and are scattered in the midst of the sandy waste like the Cyclades in the Ægean sea. The provinces of Yemen and Oman resemble

each a larger oasis, situate on the borders of the mighty desert. They bear no proportion to the desolate regions around them. We may then wonder how this fact should have been forgotten, when the whole of the southern part of the peninsula was denominated the Happy. If numerous rivers water the vales of Yemen, they are dried up ere they reach the sea, in crossing the burning plains of Tehamah. If cool breezes from the ocean refresh the groves of Aden, and waft balmy odours over the hills of Saba, the scorching breath of the deadly Samael is still the scourge of the desert from Mahrah to Mecca. A vast and sandy region, nearly a thousand miles in length, and four hundred in breadth, extends from the northern limits of Yemen to the western border of Oman; and forms a real and gloomy contrast with the delightful pictures, which the imagination paints to itself of the Happy Arabia.

The province of Yemen, properly so called, is said by Niebuhr to be about 48 German miles in length, and its mean breadth is stated by the same author to be about 20 of these

miles. But a much greater extent is assigned to Yemen by some Arabian writers. Yemen, says Ibn Haukal, contains Tehamah, Neged al Yemen, Oman, Hatsermaut, Sana, and Aden. I am not aware that any other author has mentioned Oman as appertaining to Yemen. It is however not improbable that in ancient times the whole of the southern portion of Arabia was denominated Yemen, and that Oman was consequently considered as one of the provinces included in that division of the country. The word يمن *yemen*, or, with the article, *al yemen*, signifies *the right hand*; and as he who turns towards the rising sun, has the south on his right hand, this word *yemen* came to designate the south, not only in Arabic, but in all the dialects spoken between the Euphrates and the Nile. Thus in Hebrew ימין *yemin* signifies the right hand, and the south; and תמן *temin*, derived from the same root, is yet more generally used in the latter sense. It follows from this statement, that Yemen was a name originally given to the country which bears it by a people who lived further to the north. Consequently

the whole region, from Muza to Maskat—from the shores of Tehamah to those of Oman, was once included in the division of Arabia indicated by the name of Yemen.

The mountainous portion of Yemen proper is known by the name of الجبل *El Jabal*, the Mountain. The valleys of this district are watered by many streams, which, however, as I have already mentioned, are soon absorbed by the sands, when they descend into the neighbouring deserts. *Wadi*, which originally signified water, is the word by which the Arabians denote a river, and which they apply to each of these mountain streams. This word *wadi* appears to have been pronounced *guadi* by the Moors. Thus the name of the celebrated river in Spain, the Guadalquivir, is a manifest corruption for وادي الكبير *Wadi-al-kebir*, the great river.

Tehamah, says Edrisi, *is a part of Yemen—it is bounded on the west by the Red sea, and on the east by the mountains which stretch from south to north.* This district, which is about 200 English miles in length, from north to south, and of which the mean breadth may be estimated at

about 25 of these miles, consists entirely of plains, raised little above the level of the sea. The name of Tehamah, derived from تهم *taham*, which signifies *hot*, sufficiently indicates what is the climate of this arid region.

But the name of Tehamah seems to have been confounded by some writers with the word تهايم *tehaim*, which signifies the sea coast.

In my first volume, page 360, I have inadvertently said that Muza is now called Mocha. This is not accurate. المخا, El Mocha is the most celebrated city of Tehamah, but its antiquity does not exceed five centuries. Muza, now a small city, is situate at the distance of 12 or 14 miles to the east of Mocha, at the foot of the Jabal, or mountainous region of Yemen. It will be remembered that the sacred historian describes the habitation of the descendants of Joktan as extending between Mesa, or Mesha, and Sephar, or Sepharah, a mountain of the east. Most writers, who have mentioned the subject, are of opinion that the place called Mesa in Genesis is the same which is denominated Muza by the Arabians. The only ob-

jection, as it seems to me, which can be reasonably made to this conclusion, arises from the difference of the orthography. In Scripture the name is written מֹשָׁא, which the Masorites point מֹשַׁע *Mesha;* whereas the Arabians write موزع *Muza.*

It appears that even so late as the time of Arrian, Muza was a sea-port town. This writer calls it, *a legitimate emporium situate near the sea* — ἐμπόριον νόμιμον παραθαλάσσιον. Niebuhr, speaking of Muza, says, *les Arabes regardent ce nom comme très ancien, et il n'est pas improbable que dans les tems les plus reculés, et quand Tehama étoit peut-être encore inondé, il peut y avoir eu une ville remarquable.* But there is no occasion for recurring to the most remote times. The plains of Tehamah were probably still covered by the sea for a considerable period after the Christian æra; and accordingly Muza is mentioned as a sea-port town, not only by Arrian, but by Pliny. (L. 6. c. 23.)

The mountainous portion of Yemen, designated in the language of the country as one single mountain (*El Jabal*), contains few places of

which the names can be traced to a remote antiquity. *Sana*, or *Sanaa*, which is the capital of Yemen, is said by the Arabs to be the most ancient city of the world, and to have been founded by Shem the son of Noach. Bochart cites the authority of a Jewish writer called Abraham Zachut, who had long resided in Yemen, and who says that Uzal was the ancient name of Sana. There is certainly a small town near Sana, which is called Osar. Niebuhr tells us that Osar is inhabited by Jews, for which reason it is named *Kaa el Ihud.* These words are perhaps written in Arabic characters قاع اليهود, that is, the Jewish plain or valley. Now Osar may be only a corruption for Uzal. It must however be confessed, that we ought to have better authority than either the testimony of Abraham Jachut, or the aid of a doubtful etymology, before we admit that either Sana, or Osar, once bore the name of Uzal, and was thus denominated after the son of Joktan.

The district of Abu-Arish lies to the north of Tehamah, if indeed it may not rather be considered as a continuation of that flat and burning

region. In this district, and on the western border of the Jabal, is situate a town, which is called Sabbea by Niebuhr, but which is written صبي *Sabi*, or *Dsabi*, in Arabic. There may be reason to think that this *Sabi* is the same place, which Ptolemy names Σαβὴ, *Sabe*, and Stephanus Σαβαὶ, *Sabai*. Both these authors are agreed, that this city was situate near to the Red sea; and Ptolemy fixes the latitude for 16 degrees, 50 minutes, which is precisely that assigned to Sabbea in Niebuhr's map of Yemen. But the distance of this place from the coast is at least 50 miles; whereas Stephanus expressly says that Sabai was πλησίον τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης—near the Red sea. Now this objection may be easily surmounted, if we allow, what has been already shown to be extremely probable, that the sea formerly covered the low grounds of Tehamah.

This city of Sabe, or Sabai, has been supposed by some writers to be the same which is mentioned in Scripture under the name of Saba. It has thence been concluded that Sabe was the capital of the Sabæans, who are represented by Dionysius Periegetes as having possessions on

the coast of the Red sea. Cellarius, speaking of the city in question, says, *hæc est illa* שבא, *Saba, cujus regina ad Salomonem profecta fuit,* 1 Reg. x. 1, *ubi Græci interpretes etiam* Σαβὰ *reddiderunt, perinde ac* Jerem. vi. 20: *manifeste turifera regio, in qua sita est, significatur, "quid mihi tus* משבא *ex Saba?" Æque Virgilius,

"India mittit ebur, molles sua tura Sabæi."

But Cellarius appears to me to have mistaken one city for another. The city of Saba spoken of in Scripture was situated in the interior of Arabia, at the distance of 200 miles from the Red sea. If Cellarius had attended to the Arabic orthography, he would not have committed this error. The name of the city, mentioned by Ptolemy and Stephanus as situated on the Red sea, is written صبي *Sabi,* or *Dsabi;* while the name of the city in the interior is written سبا *Saba.* If we had no other proof, this alone would suffice to show, that it is the latter name which corresponds to the Hebrew שבא, Saba.

Zebid (زبيد) is erroneously supposed by some

writers to have been the same city which Pliny (L. 6.) denominates Sabatha. Its latitude, according to Niebuhr, is 15° 20′. It is placed in a broad and fertile valley. According to Abulfeda this city was formerly the metropolis of the *tehaim-al-Yemen*, or sea-coast of Yemen. It is now 40 miles distant from the sea. This seems to afford another proof that the sea once covered the plains of Tehamah.

The principal city of Aden, or Eden, is situate on the coast of the Indian ocean. Niebuhr fixes the latitude for 12° 40′; and the longitude from Paris at 42° 30′. Aden Abian, as this city is called, was formerly a place of great trade. *Ships daily arrive in the port from India*, says Abulfeda, *and daily set sail for that country*. Most writers are of opinion that this is the place mentioned by Ezechiel (xxvii. 23.). The orthography of the Hebrew עדן exactly corresponds with the Arabic عدن.

Near to the limits which separate the desert of Yemen, called Amasia, from the extensive region of Hejaz, which stretches along the western side of Arabia from the 19th to the 30th de-

gree of latitude, there is a small but fertile district named قحطان *Kahtan.* This is the name, which the Arabians give to Jektan, or Joktan. Neither is it difficult to trace the origin of this diminutive. If we throw away the initial *jod* in יקטן, we shall have קטן *Katan;* and consequently *Kahtan* is nothing else than a corruption for Joktan, which name, if we disregard the masoretic punctuation, may be pronounced *Jokatan;* nor is it improbable that this was the original pronunciation of the word, abbreviated as we find it by the Arabians into Kahtan.

According to the sacred historian the possessions of the sons of Joktan extended from Mesa to Sepharah. It may then be reasonably supposed, that Joktan had already established himself in Arabia. Ptolemy makes mention of a people in Arabia denominated Katinitæ. These had probably been originally of the province of Kahtan.

The district of Joph (جوف) is situate to the east and north-east of Yemen, of which province, however, it is considered by some writers to be a portion. Its ancient capital was the famous city of Marab, or Maarab, known to the

Greeks and Romans by the name of Mariaba. Eratosthenes, speaking of the Sabæans, says that Mariaba was their metropolis; and after having mentioned several of the cities belonging to that people, Pliny remarks that the Queen of all was Mariaba—*regina tamen omnium est Mariaba.*

Marab was also called Saba by the Arabians. Thus Abulfeda says, in speaking of Saba the son of Yeshab, وهو الذي بني مدينة مارب وعرفت بمدينة سبا—*and it was he who built the city of Maarab, also celebrated as the city of Saba.* He then adds, *there are some who say that Maarab was the surname of a king, who reigned over Yemen; but others say that Maarab was the royal arsenal, and that the city was Saba.*

Bochart quotes the following words from Edrisi, ومن مدن حضرموت مارب وهي الان خراب وطانت مدينت سبا—*Etiam ex urbibus terræ Hadramaut erat Marab, nunc diruta; ea autem est urbs Saba.* But this writer has committed an error, as Bochart remarks, in reckoning Marab among the cities of Hadramaut. Abulfeda, however, says that this city was situate at the

extremity of the mountains of Hadramaut; and consequently the mistake of Edrisi is more excusable than it may at first sight appear. It is still clear from his evidence that Marab and Saba were different names for the same city.

It is said in the *Chabar Sail el arim*, edited by Schultens, that frequent mention is made in the ancient Arabic songs and verses of *the flood of the dykes*, وما طاب من سبا وارض مراب—*and which caused the ruin of Saba and the land of Marab.* Thus little doubt can remain of the identity of Saba and Marab. I shall presently have occasion to speak of the *sail el arim*, or *flood of the dykes.*

The Greek and Roman writers, in speaking of Mariaba, which they seem to have been aware was also called Saba, confounded, if I err not, this city with the city of Sabe, situated near to the coast of the Red sea. I have already pointed out the mistake of Cellarius; and I shall now show that that mistake originated with the classical authors.

Strabo (L. 16.) mentions Meriaba, as he writes the name, as being situated on a well-wooded

mountain—ἡ Μεριάβα κεῖται μὲν ἐπ' ὄρους εὐδένδρου. It will besides be found that he spoke of a city not far from the coast, since he states that the Minæi inhabited a part of Arabia Felix which extends along the shores of the Red sea, and that near to the country of the Minæi were the habitations of the Sabæi, whose metropolis was Meriaba. Diodorus Siculus tells us, (L. 3.) that Saba was situate on a mountain; but as he calls this city the capital of the Sabæans, he must have meant Saba, otherwise called Mariaba, which I shall however show he believed, like Strabo, to have been the city of Sabe, which was situate near the coast. In fact the town now called Sabbea, or Sabi, is placed on a mountain called *El Phej;* and this may be assumed, with every appearance of probability, to have been the site of the ancient Sabe, which is mentioned by Ptolemy and Stephanus as being near the Red sea.

Now the real metropolis of the Sabæans—the Saba, or Marab, of the Arabians—was not placed on a mountain. On the contrary, it was situate in a valley. It is said in the Koran

(Surat 34.), *the descendants of Saba saw in their dwelling a sign of our might—on the right hand and on the left were two gardens—we sent against them the flood of the dykes.* Allusion is here made to the celebrated سيل العرم *sail el arim*, or *flood of the dykes*, by which the city of Marab, or Saba, was destroyed. The Arabian authors tell us, that an immense reservoir of water had been formed by means of dykes in a narrow valley into which many streams had been conducted. During the reign of Amru, some centuries before the time of Mahomet, the dykes gave way, and the city of Marab was overwhelmed and destroyed by the inundation. *Deus*, says the Nubian geographer, *immisit in cives Marabæ torrentem maximum, qui, dormientibus ipsis, propugnaculo allisit, illudque prosternens, urbem totam cum suburbibus, oppidis, populisque abripuit.* It follows that the city was not built on a mountain; that on the contrary it must have stood in a still lower part of the valley than that in which the reservoir was placed; and that consequently Strabo and Diodorus must have mistaken some other city for Marab or Saba.

The country of Hadramaut, says Niebuhr, *is bounded on the west by Yemen; on the south-east by the ocean; on the north-east by Oman, and on the north by a great desert.* The name of this province is written Hadramaut by European authors, and perhaps this is conformable with the vulgar pronunciation of the word; but the Arabic orthography is حضرموت *Hatsermuth*, or *Hadsermuth*, and was probably خضرموت *Chatsermuth* in remoter times. I make this remark, because the Arabic word is really the same with the Hebrew חצרמות *Hatsermuth*, or rather *Chatsermuth*, which the Masorites have pointed *Chatsermaveth*, and Jerom has distorted into *Asarmoth*. Every one knows that Chatsermuth was the name of one of the sons of Joktan.

According to Ibn Haukal Hatsermuth appertains to Yemen. D'Herbelot says, that Hhadhramout, (as he writes the word,) is the name of a city and of a particular country, comprised in the great province of Yemen.

The word *Chatser-muth* signifies *atrium mortis* both in Hebrew and in Arabic. Different reasons have been assigned for this singular de-

nomination having been given to the country which bears it. Some have spoken of the insalubrity of the air; and others of the serpents which infest the territory. Be the cause of the denomination what it may, it is clear that Chatser-muth, *the hall of death*, was originally a local and not a personal name. But this name was nevertheless given to the son of Joktan. Here then I may cite a passage from Niebuhr which requires some animadversion. *Quand on entend*, says the Danish traveller, *dans les montagnes de l'Yemen et en Hadramaut nommer tant de villes qui, à ce que disent les Arabes, ont été bâties par les Hamjars, ou qui, pour parler plus juste, sont si anciennes qu'on en ignore l'origine, et qui ont tant d'affinité avec les noms que Moïse allègue, qu'on pourroit croire que cet écrivain sacré ait voulu nous donner dans la Genèse, chap.* x. 7. 26. 29, *une liste de villes Arabes dont Khus et Jaktan auroient été ou les capitales, ou les villes qui auroient fourni des colonies au reste du pays. Comme je ne puis lire les livres de Moïse dans l'original, je n'ose soutenir qu'il nous ait laissé une description de l'Yemen plutôt qu'une table généalogique.*

The sacred historian, as it seems to me, in giving us a genealogical account of the families which first peopled the earth after the flood, necessarily furnished us at the same time with a list of the names of nations, states, and cities, because these in many instances were called after their original founders. In other instances countries and cities were denominated from particular and local circumstances; and the original founder, whether of a kingdom, a colony, or a city, came often to be known by the name of the place where he had fixed his residence. It is still frequent, among nations not yet civilised, to call the possessor of a place by the name of that place, and not by his own name. In the first ages after the deluge, this custom seems to have been sufficiently common. Thus the son of Joktan, of whom we have been speaking, was clearly denominated Chatser-muth, as the possessor of the unwholesome region in which he had fixed his abode.

But as some of the patriarchs gave their names to places; and as others were denominated from their habitations; the sacred histo-

rian really gives us a geographical as well as a genealogical table in the tenth chapter of Genesis.

The capital of the country of Hatsermuth was Sabbatha, or Sabota, according to Arrian and Ptolemy. Pliny (L. 12. c. 13.) says that Sabota was situated on a lofty mountain; and adds, *à quo octo mansionibus distat regio eorum thurifera.* Niebuhr seems therefore justly to conclude that this place was the same with that now called Shibam (شبام). The same traveller states the distance of this city from Sana, the great mart of frankincense, to be eight stations; and Abulfeda, who calls it the capital of the country, says that Shibam is situate on a steep mountain. Thus it is at least probable that Sabota was placed on the same site, where now stands the modern metropolis of Hatsermuth.

The territory of Oman extends from north to south about five degrees. D'Herbelot indeed gives the name of Oman to the whole coast of Arabia from Maskat to Aden. The word العمان *Al-oman*, signifies the ocean; and it is not improbable that all the coast of the peninsula

which borders on the Indian ocean, was thence anciently known by the name of *Al-oman*. But this use of the name seems to exist no longer. The country of Oman, says Niebuhr, is bounded on the east by the ocean; on the north by the Persian gulph; and on the west and south by vast deserts. It is true that in the common editions of Abulfeda, that author is made to say that the district of Oman extends 300 pharsanks, or parasangas; but Golius corrects this error, and reads miles for parasangas.

Abulfeda says that, according to Alsahah, Sohar, (which is otherwise called the city of Oman,) is the capital of this country on the side that is next to Hejaz; and that Wivam is the principal city on the coast. There seems to be some obscurity here. Ibn Haukal, it is true, states that the province of Hejaz stretches across the peninsula from the bay of Kolzum to the Persian gulph; but Sohar is here opposed to another city on the coast, as if it itself were not situate on the shore of the same sea. Yet Abulfeda quotes Alazizi, whence it appears that he must have known the real situation of Sohar.

Jawhari describes Sohar as a city of Oman, one part of which pertains to the mountain, and the other part (literally its twin توام city,) is situate on the sea. The latitude of Sohar is 24°; and its longitude from Paris 74° 30′.

Maskat is now the most populous and flourishing city of Oman. Its latitude is 23° 37′. It is remarkable that Abulfeda makes no mention of Maskat, which however must be very ancient, since it is mentioned by Arrian under the name of Moska.

I have in vain sought among the modern denominations of the provinces and districts of Arabia Felix for one which might have some resemblance to Panchaia. It would seem that this incense-bearing region, which has been celebrated by Ovid, and honoured by the notice of Virgil, could only have been situated in the southern portion of the Arabian peninsula.

From the statements already contained in this chapter, the reader will observe that various ancient names of places still exist in Arabia, though not without some alteration of sound. It would be easy for me to extend this list of

names to a greater length than I have done; but I am unwilling to trespass further on the patience of my readers. Such investigations as these are interesting to few. To fewer still is given the art to render studies so dry agreeable to others. The very nature of my researches precludes me from the hope, or the chance, of pleasing many. I have not attempted to write an entertaining book. There is no summer reading here. But he who cannot be amusing, has it always in his power to be brief; and with this remark I shall conclude the present chapter.

CHAPTER II.

Of the ancient history of Yemen.

FROM the first view which we take of the ancient history of Yemen, the fairest, most fertile, and most celebrated region of Arabia, we might easily suppose that few difficulties would encounter us in relating the actions, or in enumerating the reigns of its monarchs. No unavailing claims have been made by the Arabians to the extravagant antiquity so idly vaunted by the Indians, the Iranians, and the Egyptians. They indeed pretend to trace the long line of their ancient princes to some of the patriarchs, who first peopled the postdiluvian world; but in making this pretension they are supported not only by their own traditions, but by the authority of the sacred Scriptures. We consequently commence the history of Arabia

with a degree of confidence, which we can never give to the legends of nations that boast an origin far more remote, without sufficient documents to prove the validity of their claims, which are besides advanced in direct contradiction to the important testimony of the Hebrew historian.

When, however, we begin to enquire by what means the Arabians could have transmitted from age to age the memory of times, which, though not fabulous, are yet so distant from the present, we must begin to question the truth of their early annals. They make, and can make, no reference to any written records which existed before the birth of Mahomet. Verses, said to be of remoter date, are indeed still recited; and in some of these, traces of ancient history have been found, or fancied, by Mahometan writers. The Arabians also vaunt their traditional lore, and value themselves on their knowledge of genealogies; but it is difficult to give much credit to historical narratives built on such uncertain foundations as these; or greatly

to trust to reports, said to have been handed down from father to son through more than a hundred generations.

Thus the reader, who turns his attention to the history of Yemen, and who might at first be inclined to put faith in the early annals of that country, soon finds his confidence in their truth and accuracy greatly diminished. Neither will his scepticism be entirely removed by a more intimate acquaintance with Arabian writers. However well disposed to believe in the traditions which they report, he will find himself perplexed by their contradictory evidence. In desiring to recognise their good faith, he must be surprised at the minuteness of some of the details into which they enter, while they speak of persons, concerning whom no written documents existed, and some of whom had been dead for more than thirty centuries before these historians themselves were born. Finally, he will refuse all credence to mere figments of the imagination, invented by Arabian vanity; and will reject, as unworthy of history, those fabu-

lous exaggerations of fancy, in which Oriental taste has always loved to luxuriate.

But although I have thought it necessary to make these observations, I would by no means thence infer, that the whole contents of the ancient annals of Arabia are to be considered as false and imaginary. Truth and fiction are generally blended together in the traditions of ages. We must not destroy the wheat with the chaff, but endeavour to separate them from each other.

The dwelling of the sons, or descendants, of Joktan, according to the sacred historian, was between Mesa, (probably Muza) and Sephar, a mountain of the East. We may thence reasonably conclude, that they gradually extended their dominion over the greater part of the southern region of the Arabian peninsula. We may indeed come to this conclusion without hesitation, since some of the names of the sons of Joktan, such as Saba and Chatsermuth, have been retained as the names of several cities and districts in Arabia Felix.

If we believe Ibn Said, Joktan, who is called

Kahtan by the Arabians, was the first, who after the confusion of languages, and the dispersion of the sons of Noach, fixed his abode in Yemen. Hamza of Isphahan pretends that Yarab the son of Kahtan went into the land of Yemen with his family, and there fixed his abode. (De Chron. Gent.)

Ibn Said, as reported by Abulfeda, likewise states that Kahtan was the first who reigned over Yemen, and who put on the *taj*, or regal diadem. But Nuweiri (Hist. Reg. Arab.) asserts that Saba was the first who assumed the title of king; while Hamza of Isphahan says the same thing of Homeir, or Himyar, the son of Saba. It would be idle to attempt to decide which of these contending traditions is right. We may, however, observe, that Hamza, in making this statement, seems to contradict himself, for he had mentioned previously, that Yarab, the son of Kahtan, was saluted by his son *with the prayer for the king*. It may have been to render this contradiction less obvious, that Schultens, with much kindness to his author, has translated the following words—واول من ملك من ولد قحطان

حمير بن سبا—*Primus qui ex posteris Kehtani absolute imperavit, est Homeir Ibn Saba.* The Arabic text simply says, *the first who reigned among the descendants of Kahtan was Homeir the son of Saba.* How this could be, if Yarab had before been saluted as king, Hamza has not informed us.

But while these authors are thus at variance with each other about the first king who reigned in Yemen after the flood; and differ among themselves, whether Kahtan, Saba, or Homeir, first assumed the regal crown; they admit that other tribes possessed the country before the Kahtanidæ. Other Arabian writers have indeed distinctly asserted that Kahtan was the last of those primitive patriarchs, whose families were established in Arabia. Hamza of Isphahan tells us that he had read in the narrative of Haitham Ibn Adi, that Arabia was originally peopled by ten families sprung from Aad, Themud, Tasm, Jadis, Amalik, Abil, Emim, Wabar, Jasm, and Kahtan. Abulfeda himself, in the tracts published by M. de Sacy, will be found to have recognised the establishment of some of these families, in the southern part of the peninsula, as prior to that

of the Kahtanidæ. In speaking of Homeir, or Himyar, who was only the third in descent after Kahtan, he says that that prince drove the descendants of Themud out of Yemen into Hejaz. He likewise clearly states that the Aadites and Amalekites, for example, inhabited Hadramaut and Yemen immediately after the confusion of languages. According to Hamza, Dsu Habshan expelled out of the provinces of Oman, Bahrin, and Yemen, all that remained of the tribes of Aad, Themud, Sachar, Jasm, Wabar, Tasm, and Jadis. This statement leaves us to suppose, that the tribes thus indicated were the most ancient possessors of the country. The author of the book of Mezhar, cited by Pococke, goes so far as to say that the descendants of Kahtan were not pure and genuine Arabians; and that by degrees they either extirpated the ancient tribes, or expelled them out of their native habitations. According to Abul Faraj, (whose short treatise on the manners of the Arabians has been illustrated by the learned comments of Pococke,) the Arabians, since the commencement of their history,

are to be divided into two classes. To the first of these classes belonged the tribes which are now extinct; and to the second the tribes which still exist. The former were very numerous, such as those descended from Aad, Themud, Tasm, and Jadis. The latter sprang from a double stem, and owed their origin to Kahtan and Adnan.

Whether then we ought to consider these tribes of Aad, Themud, Tasm, and Jadis, as the first possessors of the soil, whom the Kahtanidæ conquered, and finally drove out of the country, is a question not easily answered. If we judge from the Arabian proverb, which ranks the traditions of Tasm with empty dreams, (احاديث طسم واحلامها) we may argue that the tribes in question never ruled in Arabia. But since mention is made of these tribes by all the historians of the country, I know not why the traditions concerning them should be treated as fables.

The first name, which occurs in the list of Haitham, is Aad. The Arabians pretend that this was the son of Us, whose name is written عوس *Aus*, in Arabic, and עוץ *Auts*, in Hebrew.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis עוץ *Auts*, or Us, as the name is written in the Vulgate, is said to have been the son of Aram, the son of Sem, or Shem. Thus Aad, according to the Arabians, was of the fourth generation after Noach. His descendants established themselves in Yemen and Hatsermuth (see Pococke's notes to Abul Faraj); but their dominion over those provinces was of short duration. The Aadites and Themudites were giants, (says Abulfeda, on the authority of the Koran,) who worshipped three idols. God therefore sent to them the prophet Hud, who was the same with Eber, in order to convert them; but as only a few of them would listen to the counsels of this ambassador of heaven, God destroyed the unbelieving portion of the population, by sending against them a mighty wind, which, it is said in the Koran, blew for seven nights and eight days. (Abulfeda de Reb. Arab. ante Mohammedem.) Now excepting this miraculous interposition of Providence, which we may be easily permitted to question, though vouched for by Mahomet himself, tradition tells us nothing here which is unworthy of

credit. The sons of Joktan, the son of Eber, as we learn from the sacred historian, obtained possession of the country which we believe to have contained the provinces of Yemen and Hatsermuth. This account corresponds with that of the Arabians, who fix the æra, when the Aadites were destroyed, for the time of Eber, and who say that Joktan became the master of Yemen and Hatsermuth, the two provinces which the Aadites and Themudites had previously occupied.

The Arabians likewise say that Themud was the son of Gether, the son of Aram; and that Jadis was his brother. Tasm, they tell us, was the son of Lud, the son of Shem. Hitherto the traditions trace the first families that inhabited Arabia to persons named in the tenth chapter of Genesis—to Us, to Gether, to Lud. These patriarchs were anterior in point of time to Joktan, as must also have been their sons. The names of Aad, Themud, Tasm, and Jadis, are therefore properly made to precede that of Kahtan. A difficulty seems to occur with regard to Amalik, (عمليق) since this would seem

to be the son of Eliphaz, the son of Esau, who lived several generations after the time of Joktan. But Abulfeda tells us, that the Amalik, from whom were descended the Amalekites of Yemen, was the son of Lud. Of the origin of the tribes denominated from Abil, Emim, Wabar, and Jasm, I have not found any account in the Arabian annals.

Besides these families three others are reckoned among the extinct Arabian tribes—those of Antem, Hashen and Jorham. This Jorham (جرهم) is not to be confounded with Jorham, the son of Kahtan, or Joktan, who was perhaps the same with ירח *Jarech*. (Gen. x.)

There is nothing in these accounts of the first settlers in the southern portion of the peninsula, to which we can reasonably refuse our assent. If some idle stories have been added to them, the Arabians themselves have been the first to turn into ridicule the fables which they believe to be mingled with genuine history. Hence no doubt arose the proverb of شيا عاديا, *Shia adia, a thing of the time of Aad—an antiquated tale.*

But in the traditions which trace the Arabian tribes to their origin, we have met with nothing as yet to stagger our belief. The sacred historian has not indeed mentioned the names of the sons of Us, Gether, and Lud, of whom the Arabian writers speak; but in the time of Moses the tribes which had descended from those patriarchs were nearly extirpated. The family of Joktan had obtained the sole dominion of almost the whole of the southern portion of the peninsula. The Hebrew legislator might therefore pass over names no longer important in the general history of the world; while the Arabians themselves might preserve their memory, as connected with the early annals of their own country.

There exist, however, some other traditions among the Arabians, to which we must turn our attention, before we enter into the history of the kings of Yemen.

One of the disciples of Mahomet, says Maidani, *having asked him, whether Saba were the name of a country or of a woman; the Prophet answered, It is neither; it is the name of a man who begot the*

ten Arabians, of whom six settled in Yemen, (or in the south,) and the four others in the north. These last were Lachm, Jodham, Gassan, and Amela. Those who went to the south were Azd, Asharun, Homeir, Kenda, Madhej or Madshej, and Anmar.

There are four persons of the name of Saba mentioned in the book of Genesis. He, of whom Mahomet is said to have spoken, was the same whose name occurs in the list of the descendants of Joktan. (Gen. x. 28.) But this Saba was one of many brothers, whose possessions extended from Mesa to Sephar. It is not then easy to understand, why (with exclusion of the rest of the posterity of Joktan) he was represented by Mahomet as the father of the ten Arabians from whom sprang the ten tribes which peopled the peninsula on the north and on the south.

Before I proceed to speak more particularly of these tribes, I must be permitted to make a few remarks. In the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis Saba is named as one of those whom Joktan had begotten. But I have shown in my first volume, that the word ילד *yalad, genuit,*

is not always to be understood in a strictly literal sense. It is said of the *progenitor*, as well as of the *genitor*. According to Ibn Kotaiba, whose genealogical tables have been edited by Eichhorn, Saba was the son of Yeshab, the son of Yarab, the son of Kahtan, or Joktan. Now as all the Arabian writers, as far as I know, are agreed upon this point with Ibn Kotaiba, I should be inclined to consider Saba as a descendant, but not as the son of Joktan. The sacred historian probably named Saba, because he was the first of the posterity of Joktan, in the line of Yarab, who had become distinguished in the Arabian annals. It will likewise be found that this manner of naming the progenitor for the father, and the descendant for the son, was not peculiar to the Hebrews. In the words attributed by Maidani to Mahomet, this pretended prophet clearly uses the same license as the Hebrew historian. Saba was the progenitor, but not the immediate father of several of the persons named in the passage quoted from Maidani.

1. Lachm was the son of Adi, the son of Amru, the son of Saba. (Eichhorn, tab. 10.)

2. Jodsam (جذام) was the brother of Lachm. (Eichhorn, ibid.)

3. Gasan, or Gassan, (غسان) was the son of Al Azd, who was descended from Zaid, the son of Kahlan, the son of Saba. The tribe of Gassan established itself at Damascus. (See Abulfeda and Eichhorn, tab. 12.)

4. Amela was the son of Saba. (Eichhorn, tab. 10.) The descendants of Amela, says Abulfeda, quitted Yemen after the flood of the dykes, and settled near Damascus.

5. Al Azd was the son of Gauth, the son of Nabet, the son of Malek, the son of Odod, the son of Zeid, the son of Kahlan, the son of Saba. This is the lineage given by Abulfeda in the *excerpta* from that historian, published by M. de Sacy. The name of Odod is omitted in Eichhorn's tables.

6. Ashar, or Asharun, was one of the sons of Saba. (Abulfeda in Hist. Vet. Joktanidarum.)

7. Homeir, or Himyar, another of the sons of

Saba, succeeded him on the throne of Yemen. (Abulfeda, ibid.)

8. Kenda was the son of Saur, the son of Mortha, the son of Malek, the son of Zeid, the son of Kahlan, the son of Saba. (Eichhorn, tab. 12.) Abulfeda says that the tribe of Kenda, or Kandah, (كندة) inhabited a district of Yemen, which is in the neighbourhood of Hatzermuth.

9. Madhej, or Madshej, (مذحج) was the son of Saed Asherah, the son of Yahaber, the son of Malek, the son of Zeid, the son of Kahlan, the son of Saba. (Eichhorn, tab. 10.) But Abulfeda says that Madshej was the same with Malek.

10. Anmar was one of the sons of Kahlan. (Eichhorn, tab. 10.)

From these statements it results, that according to the historians of the country, Arabia was originally peopled by thirteen tribes descended from Aad, Themud, Tasm, Jadis, Amalik, Abil, Emim, Wabar, Jasm, Antem, Hashen, Jorham, and Kahtan, or Joktan; that the descendants of Joktan either extirpated the other tribes, or drove them out of the peninsula; that these

Joktanidæ consequently alone remained of the original inhabitants of Arabia; and that this family was divided into eleven tribes, one of which had sprung from the second Jorham, the son of Kahtan, who had settled in the province of Hejaz; and the other ten, known, in the time of Mahomet, by the names of Lachm, Jodham, Gassan, Amela, Azd, Ashar, Homeir, Kenda, Madshej, and Anmar, were all descended from Saba, the son of Yeshab, the son of Yarab, the son of Kahtan. The Sabeans considered the descendants of Ishmael and of Esau as strangers, and not as genuine Arabians.

Some errors, or at least some omissions, have been made in these statements. Several of the descendants of Cham, in the line of Cush, were indubitably established in Arabia from the earliest periods of history. Arabia is frequently called after Cush in Scripture, as must be known to every Biblical critic, though the translators have in various instances written Ethiopia instead of Arabia. Several cities and districts in this country were named after the descendants of Cush—Hevilah, Sabatha, Dadan. Now the

Arabian historians make no mention of the Chamites among the original founders of their nation; and affect to trace the origin of all their tribes to the descendants of Shem.

The same writers have said nothing of the descendants of Joktan in any other line than that of Saba; unless indeed the second Jorham be considered as the same with Jarech. Yet the tribe of Almodad appears still to have existed in the time of Ptolemy, who names a people of Arabia Felix called *Allumaiotai*. The country of Hatsermuth bears that name to the present day. Uzal is believed by some to have been the appellation of the ancient capital of Yemen. Bochart says that there was a district near the country of the Sabeans called Ophir. There were two cities in Arabia of the name of Hevilah, or rather Chevilah (חוילה). One was named from the son of Cush, and the other from the son of Joktan. The latter city was probably the same, which is now called خولان Chaulan, and which Niebuhr says is half way between Sana and Mecca. Under these circumstances it appears extraordinary that the above-men-

tioned writers should have taken no notice of any of these branches of the family of Joktan. But the sceptre of Yemen was swayed for many ages by the posterity of Saba; and the actions, and even the names, of the other descendants of the son of Eber seem to have been overlooked, or forgotten, by the Arabian historians.

CHAPTER III.

The same subject continued.

POCOCKE, in his notes to Abul Faraj, has given a list of the kings of Yemen, from Kahtan, or Joktan, to Saiph Ibn Dsi Yasan, who was contemporary with the Greek Emperor Heraclius. The same writer has taken Abulfeda, Al Jannabi, and Ahmed Ibn Yuseph, for his guides. It is my intention to follow this list in the present chapter; but I shall by no means confine myself to the scanty notices which it contains; nor shall I conceal the contradictory statements of other historians. I shall also occasionally add various anecdotes and traditions, which have been omitted by Pococke.

1. Kahtan, or Joktan, according to Ibn Said, the African, was the first monarch who reigned

in Yemen. (Abulfeda, Historia Imperii Vetustissimi Joktanidarum.)

2. Kahtan was succeeded by his son Yarab. (Abulfeda, ibid.) This prince is said by Hamza of Isphahan to have been the first of his family who occupied Yemen; and consequently Kahtan, according to this author, never reigned in that country. Hamza also asserts, that Yarab was the first who spoke in the Arabic language; (Hamza Ibn El Hasan de Chronologia Gentium;) and Abulfeda repeats this report. (Excerpta ex Abulfeda.) Yarab was the first, adds Hamza, whom his sons saluted with the salutation of the king, or with the prayer for the king. Pococke, without naming Hamza, has cited his words; and has written a long note on this prayer, which was offered up for their father by the pious sons of Yarab.

3. Yeshab, according to Abulfeda, was the next monarch who sat on the throne of Yemen. Concerning the life and actions of this prince tradition is entirely silent. It is only known that he reigned between his father Yarab and his son Saba. Human vanity seems to receive

a tacit reproach, every time that it meets with a solitary name, which has thus floated down the stream of time, like the last remnant of a wreck, telling us that there has been existence, and telling no more.

4. Nuweiri (Historia Regum Arabiæ) asserts that Saba was the first of the Kahtanidæ, who assumed the title of king. There can be no doubt that Arabian tradition represents Saba as a prince whose actions entitled him to a degree of celebrity, which had not been obtained by his predecessors. According to Isa Ibn Daab, and Abdolmelek Ibn Abdun, Saba was so named from the number of captives, which he had made. The former of these writers adds, that this name was given to the son of Yeshab, when he reconquered Yemen, and reduced all the descendants of Aad to a state of servitude. Hamza objects to this derivation, and probably with reason. Bochart thinks that Saba signifies eminent; and I observe that Ibn Kotaiba (p. 135.) says that Saba was also called *Aamer*, (عامر); which is rather a title than a name denoting the eminence of the person who bears it.

But the appellation by which Saba was most commonly designated was *Abd Shems* (عبد شمس), servant, or worshipper, of the sun.

Abulfeda tells us that this monarch undertook many expeditions, and visited many regions. But the most important events, which occurred in the reign of Saba, were the building of the city which bore his name, and the construction of the dyke and reservoir of Marab. Kaswini and Beidawi, it is true, attribute the building of the dyke to a queen of the name of Belkis, and others ascribe this enterprise to Lokman. Abulfeda, however, distinctly says, that it was Saba who built سد بارض مارب, the *sed*, or mound, in the land of Marab. (Abulfeda, de Regibus Arabum.)

The sons of Saba were Homeir, Kahlan, Amru, Ashar, Anmar, Amelah, and Mor. (Eichhorn, tab. 10.)

5. Abdolmelek Ibn Abdun has given so minute an account of Homeir, the son and successor of Saba, as can hardly fail to excite surprise, and perhaps suspicion, when it is recollected that this prince was only the ninth in

descent from Noach. *Homeir*, says Abdolmelek, *was the most intrepid man of his time; the best rider, and the handsomest person. It is said that he was named Homeir*, (حمير, which signifies red,) *from his frequently clothing himself in red garments. He was surnamed Arangej; and was the first of the kings of Yemen who placed on his head the golden crown* (تاج الذهب). *His reign lasted fifty years; and he lived in the time of Kaidar, the son of Ishmael.* Al Jannabi and Ahmed, cited by Pococke, speak nearly to the same purpose. None of these writers inform us by the assistance of what documents they were enabled thus exactly to describe the figure, the accomplishments, and the dress of a person, who must have been contemporary with the father, rather than with the grandson, of Abraham.

6. The Arabian historians are not agreed about the successor of Homeir. Little information is given upon this subject in the meagre catalogue of Pococke. That writer merely says—*Wayel, Hamyari filius; ita Abulfeda; at alii Hamyaro fratrem ipsius Cahlanum successisse volunt, et pro Wayel habent* وائل *Wathel.* But

this is an historical question, which merits some consideration. According to the statement in Nuweiri, Kahlan, the second son of Saba, succeeded to the crown after the demise of his brother Homeir. But Nuweiri assigns 300 years to the reign of Kahlan, and observes that authors differ about his successor; some naming Abu Melek, and others Al Raish, who was also called Hareth, and who was the son of Shedad. Abulfeda, on the contrary, reckons nine reigns, including that of Wayel, between Homeir and Hareth; and represents all the intervening princes as descendants of Homeir. Now it appears that when Nuweiri speaks of the reign of Kahlan as having lasted for 300 years, we ought to understand the dynasty of Kahlan. Nine reigns, according to the usual calculation by generations, would be accomplished in 297 years. No great difficulty therefore remains about the length of the period. But Abulfeda represents the throne as occupied by the descendants of Homeir, as well as others of the family of Saba, during this period, while Nuweiri only speaks of Kahlan, whose de-

scendants however are also to be understood. Thus the former historian represents the successors of Homeir as being descended from that prince; and the latter represents them as belonging to a collateral line. These contradictory statements are explained and reconciled by the information which is given us by Hamza of Isphahan, who says that the kingdom was divided at the death of Homeir, and that Marab, or Saba, became the capital of one division, and Hatsermuth of the other. It appears then that Kahlan, the brother, and Wayel, or Wathel, the son, of Homeir, made this partition, and that the kingdom remained thus divided during a period of 300 years. At the end of this period Hareth El Raish, the son of Shedad, reunited the whole country under his dominion. This prince was the first who assumed the title of تبع *Toba.* (Abulfeda, de Reg. Arab.)

7. Returning to Pococke's list, in which the line of the Homeirites is continued, we find Al Sacsac named as the son and successor of Wayel, or Wathel.

8. The successor of Sacsac was his son Japhar, or Yaphar (يعفر).

9. Dsu Riash, says Abulfeda, seized the kingdom of Yemen by force. The same, adds the historian, was Amer the son of Bazan, or Baran (in the edition of Schultens the name is printed بازان; and in M. de Sacy's باران); who was the son of Auph, the son of Homeir.

10. *Al Nooman, Yaufari filius,* says Pococke; المعافر, *Al Moafer dictus, qui collectis copiis Amerum fugavit.* The reader may consult M. de Sacy's learned note upon the meaning of the word *Moafer.*

11. Nooman was succeeded by his son Asmah.

12. After Asmah the throne was occupied by Shedad, the son of Aad, the son of Matat, the son of Saba. This prince, having established order in his own kingdom, made war upon other countries, and extended his excursions to the extremities of Africa (المغرب). He also built cities and cisterns (مصانع), which remained as the monuments of his grandeur. (Abulfeda, de Reg. Arab.)

13. *Lokman, Shaddadi frater: at Al Jannabius post Shaddadum collocat* مرثد *Morthedum, qui* ذو اود *Dhu Aud cognominatus, (quem sexcentos annos regnasse refert Al Firauzabadius) deinde* عمرو *Amrum, Morthedi filium.* (*Pocockius*, p. 59.) Both Hamza and Nuweiri mention Lokman; but neither of them intimate that he was numbered among the kings of Yemen. This Lokman was celebrated for his longevity, which Arabian writers have endeavoured to render marvellous by the aid of fables.

14. Dhu Sadad was the brother of Shedad and Lokman. (Pocockius, ibid.) Abulfeda is the only historian, as far as I am aware, who speaks of Lokman and Dsu Sadad as kings of Yemen.

15. According to Abulfeda, Hareth El Raish was the son and successor of Dhi, or as I should rather write it, Dsi Sadad. But Hamza says that El Raish was the son of Kis (قيس); while Nuweiri calls him the son of Shedad. Hamza says that this prince was the first who carried on war, obtained plunder, and brought back the spoils into the land of Yemen. The Homeirites,

being enriched in his days, and he being the same who invested them with wealth (literally who feathered them), they gave him the name of Raish, or the Featherer. Between El Raish and Homeir, there were fifteen generations (literally fifteen fathers). And in his time, continues Hamza, died Lokman, entitled Labad and Al Nasur. El Raish, in his first military expedition, went as far as India; and afterwards attacked the Turks (perhaps the robbers, for the word ترک *turk* signifies a robber both in Persian and Arabic), in Adserbijan; and having slaughtered the warriors, he made captives of their children. His reign lasted 125 years. (Hamza, Isph. Histor. Imp. Vetust. Joctanidarum.)

The reader will observe that Hamza assigns 15 generations to the interval between Homeir and Hareth El Raish; and Nuweiri repeats the same statement; but as this last writer allows only 300 years for the reign, by which he means the dynasty, of Kahlan Ibn Saba, the calculation of Abulfeda, who reckons 9 generations, is much more consistent with probability.

16. Abulfeda says that Asab was the successor of Hareth. He was surnamed *Dsu al Karnain, Dominus duorum cornuum.* This title, which sounds singular to modern ears, expressed among the ancient Orientalists the power and greatness of the prince to whom it was given. I have particularly noticed this name, because it was applied by his Oriental flatterers to Alexander the Great. The pretended son of Ammon was pleased to be represented with the horns of a ram, the emblem of the paternal God. Some writers appear to have confounded Dsu al Karnain, the king of Yemen, who is mentioned in the Koran, with the Macedonian conqueror. We learn from Abulfeda, on the authority of Ibn Said and Ibn Abas, that Mahomet meant the son of El Raish, and not الاسكندر الرومي *Alaskander El Rumi*—Alexander the Greek.

Neither Hamza, nor Nuweiri, makes mention of Asab Dsu al Karnain. They both state that El Raish was succeeded by his son Abrahah, who was surnamed Dsu al Menar, *Dominus Phari*, because, says Hamza, he was the first who constructed light-houses, and was guided

by them in his nocturnal journies. This fact announces a higher degree of civilisation, than we should have expected to find in Arabia in times so remote.

17. According to Abulfeda this Abrahah, who, by means of light-houses placed at regular distances, could find his way even by night through the Arabian deserts, was the son of Asab.

18. The successor of Abrahah, says Abulfeda, was his son Aphricus Pococke cites the authority of Jannabi, Ahmed, and the scholiast of Ibn Abdun, who pretend that Africa was named from this prince. I observe that Ibn Hamedun, quoted by Nuweiri, makes the same statement. Hamza represents the matter somewhat differently. He says that Aphricus made an excursion into Africa, and built a city, calling it Aphrikit (افريقية) after his own name. The truth seems to be, that the son of Abrahah made an incursion into Africa, whence he received the appellation of Aphricus. Nuweiri indeed pretends that this prince conducted the *Barbari* from Palestine and Egypt and the sea-coast, to

their abodes in Africa; and that these *Barbari* were the remnants of those who had escaped from the sword of Joshua the son of Nun.

19. According to Ibn Hamedun, Aphricus was succeeded by his son Alphaidar, who was surnamed Dsu al shanather. But Abulfedà makes no mention of Alphaidar; and his name is omitted by Pococke. The successor of Aphricus, according to Abulfeda, was his brother Amru, surnamed Dsu al adsaar, *Dominus terrorum.* Abdolmelek, cited by Nuweiri, gives the appellation of Alabd to this prince. Tradition tells, says Abdolmelek, that Alabd invaded the territory of the Pygmies, destroyed many of them in battle, and returned to Yemen with many captives. We have all heard of the Pygmies, "warred on by cranes;" but these Pygmies, according to Abdolmelek, had their faces in their breasts; and the sight of them so frightened the Arabians, that they gave to the conductor of these monsters the title of Dsu al adsaar, *the lord of terrors.* Fables set aside, the Pygmies were probably a people, who belonged to the unhappy race of the Troglodytes, and who

were remarkable for their deformity and diminutive size. They appear to have dwelt in Ethiopia, near to the sources of the Nile. I am aware that Homer may be quoted against me to prove that their habitation was on the shores of the ocean; but when the poet says of the cranes,

Κλαγγῇ ταίγε πέτονται ἐπ' ὠκεάνοιο ῥοάων,
Ἀνδρασι Πυγμαίοισι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φέρουσαι,

a question may arise, whether some copyist, or some critic, may not have altered *ὠκεάμοιο* into *ὠκεάνοιο*, and have thus done the same bad service to Homer, that I have shown in the second volume has been done to Diodorus Siculus. I have little doubt, that the Greeks of remoter times called the Nile *Okeamos*, in corrupting one of the Egyptian names of that river. If we believe a Greek author cited by Bochart, we must admit that the territory inhabited by the Pygmies was not near the ocean, but, on the contrary, in the interior of Africa, near the sources of the Nile. *Μεταβάλλουσι γὰρ αἱ γέρανοι ἐκ τῶν Σκυθικῶν εἰς τὰ ἕλη τὰ ἄνω τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὅθεν ὁ Νεῖλος ῥεῖ, ἔστι δὲ ὁ τόπος οὗτος περὶ ὃν οἱ Πυγμαῖοι κατοικοῦσιν*—*The cranes migrate from*

the country of the Scythians to the marshes above Egypt, whence the Nile flows; but this is the place about which the Pygmies dwell. It would seem then that Dsu al adsaar had crossed the Red sea, had invaded the territory of the people called Pygmies by the Greeks, and had brought away many captives, whose diminutive stature may have given rise to the various fables told concerning them.

20. Amru Dsu al adsaar was dethroned, according to Abulfeda, and Sherhabil his son was recognised as king of Yemen. But Nuweiri places the reign of Alhadhad immediately after that of Amru; while Hamza and Mesudi omit the name of Amru altogether.

21. Alhadhad is called the son of Sherhabil by Abulfeda and also by Hamza. Nuweiri says that Alhadhad was the son of Amru, and that Amru was not the father of Sherhabil, (as we find it asserted by Abulfeda,) but that he was his son. According to the tables of Ibn Kotaiba, Huda was the son of Sherhabil, the son of Amru. What the truth may have been, I may be permitted to say with the pious Nuweiri, الله تعالي اعلم *God above knows.*

22. Most of the Arabian historians are agreed that Belkis, the daughter of Alhadhad, succeeded to his crown; and that this was the queen of Saba, who visited Jerusalem to behold the glory of Solomon. The Homeirites assert, says Hamza, that this princess built a palace in the land of Saba, and the mound called Alarim; but others contend that this mound was constructed by Lokman, and repaired by Belkis.

23. After the death of Belkis the throne was occupied by her uncle Yasasin, who was also known by the honourable name of ناشر النعم *Nashçr al nam*, the dispenser of benefits.

Nuweiri recounts of this prince that he made an expedition into Africa, and advanced until he arrived at the river, or valley of sand, وادي الرمل which none had been able to pass. The Sultan, as Nuweiri calls him, sent a detachment of his army to explore this sandy region; but the unfortunate adventurers never returned. *Yasasin*, says the historian, *then commanded an image of brass to be erected on an open space on the edge of the valley, and had the following mandate inscribed on the breast with a graver*—THIS IMAGE IS FOR

NASHERALNAM THE HOMEIRITE. TO PROCEED BEYOND IT IS NOT LAWFUL. LET NONE ATTEMPT IT. THIS WOULD LEAD TO DESTRUCTION.

24. Shamar, surnamed يرعش Yarash, *Tremulus*, apparently from some nervous affection, was the son and successor of Yasasin, according to Abulfeda; but Hamza says that Shamar was the son of Aphricus. This writer also pretends that Shamar was the prince, who was greeted with the title of Dsu al Karnain, *lord of the two horns*. As this symbolical title indicated that the person who bore it was possessed of great power, it seems certainly more probable that it belonged to Shamar than to Asab. The Arabians represent Shamar as a great conqueror. He went forth, says Nuweiri, in the direction of Irak, in the time of Istasph, one of the kings of Persia, *and Istasph offered him homage*, واعطاه يشتاسف الطاعة. The Arabian prince then directed his march towards China; and in his way invaded Sogdiana, where he besieged a city called Shamarkand, because it was taken and destroyed (or rather pillaged) by Shamar; but afterwards pronounced Samarkand in the Arabian manner. From

Sogd, which appears to have been the ancient name of the city pillaged by the conqueror, he entered the desert country which separates Sŏgdiana from China. The Chinese monarch considered himself as lost, when his vizir put in practice the following stratagem. Having disfigured himself by cutting off his nose, he went to the camp of Shamar, who was then at the distance of ten stations from the frontiers of China; and informed him, that he had been thus mutilated by his sovereign, for having counselled him to offer no resistance to the king of Yemen. Being then questioned by this prince about the way, and where water was next to be found, the crafty vizir assured him that at the distance of three stations he would find a sufficient supply of water. Shamar trusted to his words, and made provision for a march of three days; but at the end of that period he found himself in the midst of the desert, and in a place where no springs could be discovered. The vizir then avowed the object for which he came; and the Arabian prince perished with all his army. (Hist. Reg. Arab.)

Hamza of Isphahan says that Shamar conquered the province of Chorasan, and destroyed the walls of the city of Sogd. This writer gives the same account of the origin of the name of Samarkand, as that which has been already stated from Nuweiri. He adds, that in a summer-house (مصيف) of that city, an inscription was found written in the Homeirite language, beginning with these words—IN THE NAME OF GOD SHAMAR YARASH BUILT THIS TO THE LORD THE SUN.

In these statements of Nuweiri and Hamza there is evidently much that is false, but there may be also something that is true. It would be difficult in any case to believe that the great monarch of Iran, whose empire extended from the Indus to the Mediterranean, submitted, apparently without resistance, to a toba of Yemen; but all credence must be refused to such a story, when told of a prince, whose life and actions are so well known as those of Istasph, or Yestasph, the Gustasp of the Persian, and the Darius Hystaspes of the Greek historians. The account, however, which the Arabians have

given of Shamar, is probably nothing else than a misrepresentation of facts, which might easily be made by a people not very accurately acquainted with history, and sufficiently vain of their national glory. Dukiki, one of the most ancient of the Persian poets, has described the war which was carried on by Gustasp against the monarch of China. Upon this occasion the great king may have summoned all his Arabian allies, if they were not rather his vassals, to join him in the war against his powerful antagonist. Among these allies, or vassals, Shamar may have held a distinguished place. The princes of Turan, with all the Scythian tribes, had apparently allied themselves with the Chinese; and the Arabian chief may have been instrumental in recovering for the Persian monarch some of the provinces which had been occupied by the enemy. Thus Shamar may have been the successful leader, who drove the foes of Iran from Sogdiana and Chorasan. He may have conducted the siege of the city of Sogd, then held by the Scythians; and when he succeeded in taking it, the king of Persia, as a

mark of his satisfaction, may have ordered the city to be called Shamarkand. But this name would not signify *ruined or pillaged by Shamar*, but *Shamar-town ; kand* signifying a town in the Persian language. With regard to the inscription mentioned by Hamza, I am inclined to consider it as a forgery. The words بسم الله —*in nomine Dei*, so frequent in the mouth of a pious Mussulman, were not likely to have prefaced a dedication to the Sun, written by a worshipper of that luminary.

25. The reign of Abimelek, the son of Shamar, seems to have been of short duration. Nuweiri says that this prince went into Africa, where he perished in seeking for the valley of الزبرجد *Alzabarjad*, or of the emeralds.

26. In Pococke's list, Amran the son of Amir, and a descendant of Kahlan, is named as the successor of Abi, or Abu Melek. It appears therefore that at this epoch the sceptre passed from the house of Homeir into that of Kahlan. Pococke has followed, as usual, the statement of Abulfeda ; and it must be by an error of the press that *Amrou Ibn Amir* is

printed in the version of Schultens, since in the Arabic text we find عمران بن عامر *Amran ben Aamir*.

27. The next name in Pococke's list is that of Amru, the son of Amir. It follows that Amru was the brother of Amran. This prince was surnamed مزيقيا *Mazikia, lacerator*, because, says Abulfeda, he put on a new garment every morning, and ordered it to be torn every night when he retired to rest, in order to prevent any other person from wearing it after him. This anecdote is singular, and affords a curious example of egotism. I have copied it from Abulfeda; though Pococke seems to have found an account somewhat different in that author. But it is of more importance to enquire, whether the sons of Amir ever reigned over Yemen.

M. de Sacy has examined this question at great length, and concludes by giving it as his opinion, that Amran and Amru ought not to occupy a place among the sovereigns of Yemen, who reigned over all the descendants of Saba. I am convinced, adds he, that they ought to be considered as individual chiefs of the descendants of Cahlan, or even simply of the tribe of

Azd, who recognised the sovereignty of the Himyarites. (Mem. de Liter, p. 520.)

It is not without considerable hesitation that I venture to differ from M. de Sacy. My limits do not permit me to enter into an examination of all the arguments employed by this learned man; but it seems that the strongest which he brings forward, is that which is founded on the silence of Hamza, Nuweiri, and Mesudi. These writers have not mentioned the sons of Amir among the kings who reigned over Yemen. I must, however, be permitted to doubt, whether the silence of the three historians, whom I have just named, is not more than counterbalanced by the positive statements of Ibn Said and Abulfeda. No one can better appreciate the merits of all these writers than M. de Sacy. He well knows the glaring anachronisms which so frequently recur in the narrative of Hamza; nor is he a stranger to the fables which crowd the pages of Nuweiri. If from the silence of Mesudi we ought to erase the names of Amran and Amru from the list of the kings of Yemen, we ought equally to exclude from it that of Abi

Melek, whose reign is unnoticed by that historian.

It cannot be questioned that Amru resided at Marab, and that he is called king by Mesudi himself. But the title of king, or malk, may have been occasionally given to the chiefs of powerful tribes; and M. de Sacy argues, on the authority of Mesudi, that Dhafar was the ordinary residence of the sovereign princes of Yemen, and that consequently Amru, who resided at Marab, or Saba, and was there called king, or malk, ought not to be reckoned among the sovereigns who governed the whole of Yemen, and whose usual abode was at Dhafar.

It may be questioned, I think, whether M. de Sacy has not too hastily interpreted the meaning of Mesudi in his own favour. This author, as I understand him, says that *the kings of Yemen resided in the city of Dhafar, or Dsaphar; like Dsi Shajar, and the family of Dsi Al Kalaa; but that a few dwelt in other cities.* Mesudi seems here to speak of the kings of Yemen in times not long anterior to the birth of Mahomet. Certainly other authorities would

lead us to suppose that Marab, or Saba, was the residence of the sovereigns of Yemen until the time of the inundation. It is said in the Koran (Surat 34), *the descendants of Saba have seen in their habitations a sign of our power.* Allusion is here made to the flood of the dykes. But the descendants of Saba consisted only of persons of the blood royal. I find the following words cited by the learned and industrious Rommel—*olim fuit* (*Marab*) *metropolis Tobabaah* تبابعه (*in singulari* تبع). This author refers to Sir W. Ouseley's Preface to Ibn Haukal. Now the *Tobas* were unquestionably the sovereigns of the whole region known by the name of Yemen; and the title of *Toba* may be more nearly rendered by the word emperor than by any other. It cannot be doubted that Queen Belkis resided at Marab. Hamza, as has been already mentioned, says that that princess built a palace in the land of Saba. An Arabian author, quoted by M. de Sacy, affirms that *the throne of Belkis, which was raised on columns, each twenty-eight cubits in height, adorned the city of Saba.* Edrisi says, *etiam in urbe Marab est arx,* AL KASIB,

quæ fuit palatium Belkis uxoris Solomonis. Philostorgius calls Saba the metropolis of Arabia Felix. He tells us that the region inhabited by the Sabeans and Homeirites, *μεγάλην τε Ἀραβίαν καλεῖσθαι καὶ εὐδαίμονα πρὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων—ἧς μητρόπολις ἡ Σάβα, κ.τ.λ.—was called the great and happy Arabia by the Greeks—the metropolis of which was Saba.*

To return then to Amran and Amru, I am inclined to think that these descendants of Kahlan usurped the throne of Yemen, which was again occupied by a prince of the line of Homeir, when Amru fled from Marab.

28. Alakran, the son of Abimelek, says Hamza, reigned in the time of Behman, the son of Isphendiar, the son of Istasph. This prince was known by the name of the second Toba. It will be remembered that when Al Raish reunited all the provinces of Yemen under his sway, by wresting their possessions from the descendants of Kahlan, he assumed the title of Toba, which I have already mentioned as being nearly equivalent to emperor. Now it seems to me to be a strong proof in favour of the regal existence of Amran

and Amru, that Alakran, who was a Homeirite by birth, received this title of Toba, which would seem to indicate that, like Al Raish, he had vanquished the descendants of Kahlan, and had made himself master of the whole territory of Yemen.

[redacted]n Hamedun mentions that the flood of the dykes took place in the time of Alakran; and I conceive that this event happened in the first year of his reign, shortly after the flight and abdication of Amru. The history of this prince and of the *Sail el arim*, given at great length by Mesudi, has been abridged by the elegant pen of M. de Sacy. Referring the reader to these writers, I must request of him to be satisfied here with a far more concise account of this wonderful, but rather tedious story.

"During the reign of Amru Ibn Amir, a prophetess called Taripha, who lived in the city of Marab, was alarmed by nocturnal visions for the fate of her country. Having at length obtained access to the king, that prince was surprised at the menacing language which she held, and enquired what was the misfortune

with which she threatened the city and the kingdom. 'Go, Amru,' she answered, 'towards the dyke of the reservoir. If you see there a rat which loosens the stones of the mound with its feet, be sure the evil is near, and our destruction inevitable.'

"Amru went to the dyke, and beheld a [redacted] loosening the stones of the mound. 'This terrible monster,' said he to Taripha, at his return, 'resembled a wild boar; its bristles were red; its fangs were like those of the hyæna; it gnawed the huge stones, as if they had been straw-mats of Selem.'

"Amru being convinced that the fatal moment was fast approaching, resolved to sell all his possessions, and to retire from Yemen. Fearing, however, that if his resolution were known, the cause of his departure would be suspected, and that it would become difficult for him to dispose of his property, he agreed with one of his sons to put in practice the following stratagem. He invited the principal persons of the city to a feast. The father and son pretended to quarrel. The former struck the latter; and the blow

was returned. Amru rose in great apparent wrath, and swore that he would for ever quit a city where he had received such an affront; but that before his departure he would sell all his possessions, in order to prevent his children from inheriting them. 'Let us hasten,' said the guests of the prince, 'to turn his anger to our own advantage; nor let us give him time to reflect and to repent.' The whole property of Amru was quickly sold; and that king, having abdicated the throne, retired from Marab, and established himself at Ak in the province of Hejaz. The inundation happened shortly afterwards, when the whole district was overwhelmed; public edifices and private houses were destroyed; and all the inhabitants of Marab perished, with the exception of a few, who had had time to escape to the mountains." (Mesudi, Histor. Diluvii El Arim.)

There appears to have been little generosity in this transaction on the part either of Amru or of his subjects. When stripped of the marvellous with which it has been clothed, the story may be reduced to a very narrow compass.

The king of Saba saw that the mound of the reservoir was in a state of decay, and being apprehensive of the consequences, was induced to quit his country and his throne. Nor is it improbable that the fear of being soon forced at any rate to yield up the sceptre to Alakran, its legitimate possessor, may have contributed not a little to engage Amru to adopt this measure.

If we believe Nuweiri, Alakran the son of Abimelek, the son of Shamar, was more fortunate in his military career than this last-mentioned prince. The master of Iran, he proceeded to Sogdiana, rebuilt the walls of Samarkand, invaded China, and laid in ruins the capital of that empire. He then founded a new city, says the historian, and peopled it with a colony of thirty thousand Arabians. This romance may have been in some degree founded on fact. Alakran, as the ally, or as the vassal, of the great king, may have been engaged in one of the frequent wars, which were carried on between the rival monarchs of Iran and Turan, and in which the Persian historians pretend that the sovereigns of China occasionally took

part. Upon this slender foundation Arabian vanity has probably built the rest of the story.

29. The name of Dhu or Dsu Habshan appears the next in Pococke's list. This prince, according to Hamza, expelled or extirpated all the remaining descendants of Tasm and Jadis.

30. Toba, the son of Alakran, and the brother of Dsu Habshan, is merely designated by his title. But the statements of the Arabian historians are here so confused and contradictory, as to make it hardly possible to reconcile them. Ibn Hamedun names Asad Ibn Amru as the successor of Alakran; and is silent with regard to Dsu Habshan. According to the same author, Morthed, the son of Abd Kalal, the son of Alakran, was the successor of Asad.

Hamza calls Toba the son of Alakran, the son of Shamar. Yet this writer had before designated Alakran as the son of Abimelek.

31. Pococke says, *Colaicarb, vel, ut Al Jannabius et Ahmed Ebn Yusef,* ملیک یکرب *Molaic Yocrab, Tobbai filius.* Hamza writes the name ملکیکرب Melek Yakarb; and I know not why Schultens

has altered it in his version to Colaicarb. This indeed is the orthography of Abulfeda.

32. Abu Karb Asad, who was called *Al-wāsat Toba*, the middle Toba, and of whom mention is made in the Koran (Surat 44 and 50), flourished, it is said, seven hundred years before Mahomet. According to Nuweiri this Toba adorned the Caaba with a golden gate. The inhabitants of Yemen are said to have been converted to Judaism during the reign of Abu Karb.

33. Hassan Ibn Toba was the successor of Abu Karb Asad. According to Ibn Hamedun, this prince invaded Irak, or Arak, with an army of three hundred thousand men. He then turned his course towards Mecca, where, says the historian, he composed verses in which he predicted the mission of Mahomet. Having again marched into Irak, he formed the project of conquering the empires of Iran and China. His troops, however, were dissatisfied (as well they might be) with this scheme; and Amru, the brother of Hassan, conspired against him, and murdered him while he was asleep. Ibn

Hamedun says that the death of this prince took place during the minority of the Persian king, سابور ذو الاكتاف *Sabor Dsu Alaktaph.*

Abu Ali Ahmed makes a very different statement. He says that the king of Persia, against whom the Arabians declared war, was Kobad the son of Phiruz; and that this war took place during the reign of Toba, the father of Hassan. Toba sent his nephew, Shamar al Janah, against Kobad, who was defeated by this Arabian prince, and slain at Alrei. The same Toba afterwards sent his son Hassan to join Shamar; and these cousins invaded Sogdiana with an army of six hundred and forty thousand men.

Not satisfied with this mighty enterprise, Toba sent another of his nephews, called Japhar, or Yaphar, الي الروم *in Romanas ditiones*, as Schultens has it, but as I would rather translate it, *into Greece.* Yaphar proceeded to Constantinople, and took that city. He then advanced into Greece, where he and his whole army perished, the victims of pestilence and famine.

In the mean time Shamar Dsu al Janah car-

ried on the war in the east with better success. He was indeed delayed for a considerable time before the walls of Samarkand. Having, however, taken prisoner one of the guards of that fortress, he conciliated his captive by soothing language, and then interrogated him concerning the city and concerning the king. The soldier informed him that the king was entirely occupied with the gratification of his sensual appetites; but that the princess, his daughter, governed in his stead, and carefully attended to the interests of her country. Shamar Dsu al Janah gained over this man to his interests, and engaged him, at a time fixed, to give a certain signal by the sound of drums. The Arabian chief then sent him back with presents, and a message to the princess. *Tell her*, said he, *that Dsu al Janah has come from the land of Magrab, the regions of the west, excited by the reputation of her wisdom, in order to espouse her, and to beget by her a son, who may reign over the Arabians and Persians. Tell her too that I have not come hither to acquire wealth—I, who have brought with me four thousand heavy chests of*

gold and silver. I wish all these to be carried into the city, and there deposited; because if the country become mine she shall be my bride; and if I perish all these riches will belong to her. The traitor delivered the message. The princess listened, and was deceived. The chests were admitted within the gates. A signal was given. The lids of the chests flew open, and Samarkand was taken.

34. Amru, according to Abulfeda, was the successor of his brother Hassan, whom he had murdered. Hamza and Abulfeda say that this prince was surnamed *Dsu alawaad*, a title which Nuweiri gives to Morthed. Both Pococke and Schultens translate this title *Dominus lignorum;* because he who bore it was so infirm, that he was carried about on a wooden seat. This version appears to me to be very questionable.

35. Abd Kolal succeeded to his father Amru on the throne of Yemen. Hamza says of this prince that he was of the religion of the Messiah, وكان على دين المسيح; but the same author adds that he never openly professed that religion.

36. The Arabian historians are not agreed about the genealogy of Toba Hassan, surnamed *Toba asgaar*, *Toba minimus*, the successor of Abd Kolal. I find it impossible here to reconcile Abulfeda with Nuweiri. The latter historian makes no mention of Abd Kolal as king of Yemen.

37. The next name in Pococke's list is that of Al Hareth Ibn Amru. Abulfeda says that he embraced the Jewish religion. According to Nuweiri, Al Hareth divided the kingdom among his three sons, Hojar, Sherhabil, and Salmi. The name and the reign of Al Hareth are not even mentioned by Hamza.

38. Morthed, the son of Kolal, is named by Abulfeda as the successor of Al Hareth. But this same Morthed is placed at an epoch much anterior by Nuweiri, who calls him the son of Abd Kolal, the son of the Toba Alakran.

39. Hamza and Abulfeda are agreed, that the kingdom of Yemen was divided at the death of Morthed. It appears, however, that the principal portion fell to the lot of Wakiah

or Waliah, the son of Morthed, according to both historians.

40. Abrahah Ibn Alsabah succeeded to Wakiah.

41. According to Abulfeda Sahban was the successor of Abrahah. Nuweiri says, that Hojar and Sherhabil, the sons of Al Hareth, having been killed by their subjects, Sahban took up arms against the rebels, who, however, defeated and slew him. Pococke, who takes no notice of Nuweiri, observes that Al Jannabi and Ahmed put Ibn Dakikan in the place of Sahban. To this Ibn Dakikan, adds Pococke, belonged the celebrated sword of Amru Ibn Maad Karb, which was called *samsama;* and which afterwards came into the possession of the Caliph al Rashid. It is related that the Greek emperor sent some swords of excellent workmanship as presents to the Caliph, who in the presence of the ambassadors cut them into shreds with the fine edge of his *samsama.*

42. Amru, according to Abulfeda, was the successor of Sahban. Pococke, I know not why, has omitted this name. Nuweiri says, that

at the death of Sahban the throne was occupied by Alsahab, the son of Ibrahim, the son of Alsahab.

43. The next sovereign of Yemen was not descended from the blood royal of Saba. His name was *Dsu Shanater*. But the historian may be permitted to drop the curtain at once on the life and death of this usurper.

44. Dsu Nowas, according to Hamza, was the last descendant of Homeir who sat on the throne of Saba. This prince commenced his reign with every advantage, which his birth, his youth, and his moral character could procure for him. The Arabians, it may be easily supposed, were rejoiced at the happy times which they believed to be coming. But clouds soon gathered, and darkened this fair prospect. The king's habits were moral, but his temper was morose; and long before he terminated his unhappy career, Dsu Nowas was hated as a ferocious tyrant, and as an intolerant bigot. He appears to have thought that with regard to religion there can be but one opinion which is right; and upon this point no sound reasoner

would be inclined to differ from him; but unluckily he fancied that the right opinion was his own; and that no punishment could be too severe for those who ventured to think otherwise. When intolerance is armed with power, the effects are terrible. Dsu Nowas was a convert to Judaism; and he persecuted the opponents of his creed with inflexible zeal and unrelenting cruelty. His animosity, however, was chiefly directed against the Christians. Hamza of Isphahan informs us that this tyrant attacked the Christians in the city of Nejaran, the principal place of their residence in Arabia, and caused all of them that could be found, without regard to sex or age, to be thrown into a pit, in which these unfortunate victims were burnt to death.

The king of Ethiopia, taking advantage of the troubles, which the cruelty of Dsu Nowas had caused in Yemen, crossed the Red sea, and invaded Arabia with an army of seventy thousand men. Dsu Nowas was defeated in the first battle that was fought. In this reverse of fortune he showed that he feared death less

than slavery. Mounted on a fleet courser, he escaped from the enemy, who, however, still pursued him. At length, gaining the height of a promontory, he threw himself into the sea, exclaiming, والله الغرق افضل من اسر السودان *By God, it is better to be drowned than to be made a prisoner by the Blacks.*

Abulfeda says, that Dsu Giadan was the successor of Dsu Nowas, and was the last monarch of the race of Homeir. But here I am inclined to follow the opinion of Hamza, and to consider Dsu Nowas as the last of the Homeirite princes who reigned in Yemen. The conquest of Yemen by the Ethiopians probably took place about forty years before the birth of Mahomet.

I have hitherto abstained from making any chronological remarks on the history of the kings of Yemen. Neither is it with the intention of depreciating the labours of others, that I confess myself unable to reconcile the chronology of the Arabian historians with truth or even with probability. We find various examples in Hamza and Nuweiri of the reigns of

monarchs, which are said to have lasted 160, 180, 300, even 400 years. It may be said that we ought to understand dynasties for reigns. Let this be admitted. We shall still have many formidable difficulties to encounter.

Both Hamza and Abulfeda reckon the number of Homeirite kings, that is to say the monarchs directly sprung from the blood royal of Homeir, to be 26; both these historians assign 2020 years for the duration of the reigns of these monarchs, and Abulfeda remarks the improbability of so few reigns having occurred in so long a period of time. The calculation indeed would give us between 77 and 78 years, at an average, for the reign of each king.

If we turn to Pococke's list of the kings of Yemen, we shall find only 44 reigns between Joktan, or Kahtan, and Abrahah al ashram. Mahomet was born in the time of Abrahah, about the year 570 of the Christian æra. Joktan was the grandson of Salech, who was the great-grandson of Noach. It may be difficult to fix the exact number of years which elapsed between the death of Joktan and the birth of

Mahomet. Let us, however, reckon only 2500 years, a period probably much shorter than the real one; and yet we should have thus to assign nearly 58 years at an average to each of these 44 reigns. This calculation would be highly improbable, even if the kings of Yemen had succeeded each other in regular succession from father to son; but it is utterly incredible that only 44 kings should have reigned in a monarchy, which lasted without interruption for 2500 years, and in the history of which we hear of brothers succeeding to brothers, and even uncles to nephews.

Several eminent writers have thought that much light might be thrown on Arabian chronology by means of the synchronisms which Hamza of Isphahan has pretended to establish between the æras of some of the kings of Persia and of Yemen. But this mode of establishing dates can only be relied on where the authorities are good. Before we give faith to an historian, who speaks of the kings of two different countries as contemporary with each other, we ought to be convinced that he is well acquainted with

the annals of both nations. How then shall we trust to Hamza? His history must be false, if his chronology be true. Where indeed he speaks of some of the last princes of the dynasty of the Sassanidæ, and of the later kings of the house of Homeir, his reckoning approaches in some instances, though not in all, to the truth. But if we follow him to remoter times, we shall find his pretended synchronisms to be real anachronisms.

According to this writer Sahban reigned in Yemen during the whole time that Yezdegerd the first and his son Behram Giaur sat upon the throne of Persia. Now these two monarchs reigned each 20 years, from the year 400, to the year 440, of the Christian æra.

But Hamza tells us that he had read in the history of Yemen, that Abrahah, the predecessor of Sahban, lived في زمن سابور بن هرمز ذي الاكتاف *in the time of Sabor the son of Hormuz Dsi Al Aktaph*. This Sabor, or Sapor, was therefore the second of that name; and his reign, which was coeval with his life, lasted from the year 310 to the year 380. But Sahban succeeded to

Abrahah in the year 400; and we must therefore suppose that his reign could not have commenced until Sapor was well advanced in years. To this conclusion we may come the more easily that his predecessor Waliah reigned for 37 years, and that, according to Nuweiri, he was raised to the throne by the Homeirites apparently as the chief of a party.

We must, however, leave to conjecture the exact epoch, when Abrahah mounted the throne. We only know for certain from Hamza's account, that he was succeeded by Sahban in the year 400.

But Hamza has been precise with respect to the five predecessors of Abrahah. Amru ibn Toba reigned 63 years; and was succeeded by Abd Kalal, who reigned 74 years. The next monarch was Toba, who reigned 78 years. Morthed reigned 41 years; and Waliah 37. The sum of all these reigns amounts to 293 years. Now, according to Hamza, or the guides whom he followed, Amru ibn Toba was contemporary with Sapor the son of Ardeshir, that is to say with Sapor the first. This prince be-

came king of Persia in the year 238 of our æra. Thus from the commencement of his reign to the year 400, when Abrahah died, there were only 162 years; yet Hamza assigns 293 years to the reigns of five kings of Yemen, the first of whom was contemporary, he says, with Sapor the son of Ardeshir, and the last of whom was the predecessor of Abrahah.

I would now ask, how we are to reconcile the two synchronisms—that which makes Amru ibn Toba contemporary with Sapor the first—and that which makes Abrahah contemporary with Sapor the second? Sapor the first reigned from the year 238 to the year 271. Sapor the second reigned from the year 310 to the year 380. But 293 years elapsed between the time that Amru ibn Toba became king of Yemen, and the time when Abrahah obtained the same dignity. It is obvious that one of the two synchronisms proposed by Hamza must be altogether erroneous.

The two kings, who were the predecessors of Amru ibn Toba, are named by Hamza Asad Abu Karb, and Hassan ibn Toba. The former

reigned 20 and the latter 70 years. But Hamza tells us that Asad Abu Karb was contemporary with Ardeshir. But how could this be, if Amru ibn Toba was contemporary with Sapor the son of Ardeshir? We know that Ardeshir reigned from the year 226 to the year 238, and Sapor from this last epoch to the year 271; the whole period being 45 years. Hamza places 70 years between Asad Abu Karb, whom he calls the contemporary of Ardeshir, and Amru ibn Toba, whom he calls the contemporary of Sapor.

According to Hamza, or his historical guides, Shamar Yarash Abu Karb was contemporary with Istasph, the monarch whom the Persians called Gustasph, and the Greeks Darius Hystaspes. Hamza reckons five reigns between Shamar Yarash Abu Karb, and Asad Abu Karb. Now we have seen that he makes Asad Abu Karb contemporary with Ardeshir the first king of the dynasty of the Sassanidæ. But Darius Hystaspes began to reign 522 years before Christ, and Ardeshir mounted the throne 226 years after Christ. The period amounts to 748 years; and for this period Hamza counts

the reigns of five kings, thus assigning to each of these princes a reign of nearly 150 years in duration.

I shall not enter into any further details concerning the chronology of the Arabians. Confidence may indeed always defy contradictions; ingenuity may sometimes escape from perplexities; and conjecture may still be useful in propping up the weak parts of a system; but in historical researches, and especially in the department of chronology, the lover of truth will rather give the curb than the spur to the courage of his imagination.

POSTSCRIPT.

ACCORDING to Abdolmelek, Homeir, or Himyar, was contemporary with Kaidar, the son of Ishmael. I have objected to this statement, because Homeir was of the ninth generation after the flood, and Kaidar was of the twelfth. Thus Homeir ought to have been contemporary

with Tharach (תרח), the father of Abraham. But since I sent the manuscript of the preceding chapter to England, it has occurred to me that Abdolmelek might not have made so great an error as I at first supposed, and that if he were not mistaken upon the point in question, the synchronism which he establishes might lead to results highly important to those who are occupied in examining the early annals of Arabian history.

Heber, or Eber, according to those who follow the chronology of the Vulgate, died in the year 2312 before Christ, at the age of 464 years. Tharach, who was fifth in descent from Eber in the line of Phaleg, was born in the year 2171 B. C., and died at the age of 205 years, 1966 years before Christ. As Homeir, according to the Arabians, was fifth in descent from Eber in the line of Joktan, we might conclude, that the death of Homeir ought not to be remote in point of time from that of Tharach. But at the period of which we are speaking, the lives of men, though rapidly shortening from what they had been before the deluge, were greatly longer than they have been in later æras of the world. We cannot, therefore, compare dates in genealogies of those times, upon the same principles, or according to the same rules, as we do at present. If we were to compare dates between two genealogies of later ages, and were to find a difference of 130, or 140 years existing between two persons, both of whom

were said to be the fifth in descent from the same progenitor, we should probably conclude that the statement was entirely erroneous. At a period, however, when the lives of men were protracted to two or three centuries, a difference of even 150 years might easily occur in the duration of two families, in the course of five generations.

Nuweiri tells us that the reign of Saba, the great-grandson of Joktan, lasted 484 years. But I can have little doubt that we ought to include in this reign, or rather dynasty, Joktan, Yarab and Yeshab, who were the predecessors of Saba on the throne. Now if we suppose the reign of Joktan to have commenced when his father Eber died, (for the Arabians say that Eber, whom they call Hud, was already in Yemen,) in the year 2312 B. C., Homeir the son of Saba ought to have commenced his reign in the year 1828 B. C., 484 years after the death of Eber. But Hamza of Isphahan says that Homeir lived until worn out with old age; and Nuweiri assigns 50 years to his reign, which, at the period in question, supposes him to have been already well advanced in life before he ascended the throne. It follows, however, that the æra of Homeir's death must be fixed for the year 1778 before Christ.

Now the death of Ishmael happened in the 137th year of his age, 1878 years before Christ, and 100 years before the æra which has been fixed for the death of Homeir.

But if Homeir lived as many years as Ishmael, or if he lived a century, which in those times would not have made a long life, he must have been, as Abdolmelek states, contemporary with Kaidar the son of Ishmael.

Homeir must also have been contemporary with Esau, the twin-brother of Jacob. The last account which we have of Esau, in the book of Genesis, is that he went to dwell in Mount Seir, when he separated himself from his brother. This happened in the 98th year of his age, and according to Usher 1843 years before Christ. Thus Esau was established in Mount Seir 15 years before Homeir began to reign in Yemen.

The reader will remember that Esau was also called Edom—*ipse est Edom*. But Edom bears the same signification in Hebrew, that Homeir, or Hinyar, does in Arabic. Both names equally signify *Red*. Now it is surely a most singular coincidence, that two chiefs of Arabia should both be known at the same remote period by the same remarkable denomination.

In spite of the apparent accuracy with which the Arabians pretend to speak of the genealogy of Homeir, who died, according to the calculation given above, 2348 years before the birth of Mahomet, it may be possible—it may even be probable, that Homeir was no other than Esau, or Edom

1. The usual life of man, at the period of which we are

speaking, extended to 140 or 150 years. Jacob at his death was 147 years of age. Esau went to dwell in Mount Seir when he was 98 years old. As nothing more is said of him in Scripture, he may have gone 15 years afterwards into Yemen, and have taken possession of that country in the 113th year of his age. Neither in that period of longevity, is it improbable, that he may have resided there for 50 years, and have died in the 163d year of his age, 1778 years before the Christian æra. Thus no chronological objection can be well advanced against the identity of Edom and Homeir.

2. The Arabians say that Homeir was the eldest son of Saba. If this had been the case, it is difficult to understand how Kahlan, a younger son of Saba, could pretend to have an equal right with Wathel the son of Homeir; and how he should have prevailed on Wathel to share the kingdom with him, and to cede to him the whole region of Hatzermuth. Nor is this all. We find that continual struggles took place for the throne between the descendants of Homeir and the descendants of Kahlan.

3. The inhabitants of Yemen were frequently denominated Sabæans, and not less frequently Homeirites. Whence arose this difference in the denomination of the people? If Homeir had been the son of Saba, the Homeirites, or descendants of Homeir, were necessarily also Sabæans, and descendants of Saba. May it not be sus-

pected that these inhabitants of Yemen were a mingled people, some of whose tribes were descended from Saba, and others from Homeir; and that between those two personages there existed no more consanguinity than might be traced to their common descent from Eber?

4. In the time of Esau Arabia must still have been thinly peopled. Esau was possessed of numerous flocks and herds. When he had established his children in the northern parts of Arabia, he may have sought the more fertile regions of the south; and he had probably a sufficient number of adherents to dispute the territory of Al Yemen with the posterity of Joktan. He had married a daughter of Ishmael, the full sister of Nabaioth; and if he engaged in any expedition against the Joktanidæ, he would probably be assisted by the Ishmaelites. He had likewise married several other wives among the Canaanites, and seems to have been allied with all his neighbours. If then he invaded the southern provinces of Arabia, he might have mustered a force sufficient to execute his project.

5. The Arabians know Esau by the name of عيص *Ais*. Kessæus says that Ais married the daughter of a king of Ethiopia, by whom he had two sons. But in order to give the least colouring of probability to this tradition, we must suppose that Esau had quitted the mountains of Seir, and the land of Edom, to establish himself in the southern part of the peninsula, where he could easily have

had communication with the Ethiopians across the Arabian gulph. Thus tradition seems to tell that Esau had actually gone to settle in Al Yemen.

6. The same Kessæus relates a story, which, though very absurd, proves that tradition confirms, in another instance, the surmises which I have been making. Jacob is stated to have foretold to Esau that he should be the progenitor of *Dsu al Karnain*. Now we have already seen that by *Dsu al Karnain*, the Arabians originally designated one of the kings of Yemen, and not Alexander the Great, as some have supposed. The king of Yemen, who was thus named, was descended, according to Abulfeda, from Homeir.

7. Yarab the son of Joktan, or Kahtan, is said to have introduced the pure Arabic into Yemen, and to have deflected it from the Syriac. If Homeir had been the descendant of Yarab, he would naturally have spoken the same language as his great-grandfather, who had introduced the use of the new dialect. It is remarkable then, that the descendants of Homeir used so much Syriac or Chaldaic in the dialect which they spoke, that the Homeirite language was not understood by the other Arabians. (Pococke, p. 156. D'Herbelot, p. 447.) An Arabian was introduced to one of the Homeirite kings, who happened to be seated on the brink of a precipice. The prince, wishing to do honour to the stranger, said to him ثب *theb*.

The unhappy man, who believed his life ought to be sacrificed, if his sovereign desired it, leaped over the precipice. The king and his retinue were astonished; and after due enquiry it was found, that *theb*, which in Syriac and Chaldaic signifies *sit down*, in Arabic signifies *leap*. (Pococke, p. 157.) Now if Edom and Homeir were two different names for the same person, we can understand how the descendants of this person spoke a dialect different from the other Arabians, and more mingled with Chaldaic and Syriac words.

8. Among the original inhabitants of Yemen are numbered the Emim. But the Emim, according to the sacred historian, dwelt on the eastern coast of the Dead sea until they were expelled by the Moabites. The Arabian writers, therefore, must be in error, when they speak of the Emim as having settled in the southern part of the peninsula, as early as the family of Joktan. Moab was born in the year 2001 B. C., 60 years before the birth of Esau. The descendants of Moab might therefore have been sufficiently powerful in the course of 170 years to have expelled the Emim from their country. It seems not improbable that 173 years after the birth of Moab, the Emim, expelled from their native habitations by the Moabites, may have migrated into Yemen. But this is the epoch, 1828 years B. C., when I suppose Esau to have invaded the territory of the Joktanidæ; and these

Emim may have acted as his auxiliaries. We cannot for a moment oppose Arabian tradition to the testimony of the sacred historian. Now it is clear from Scripture that the kingdom of the Moabites was already fully established in the time of Balak. Moab was born, as we have just seen, in the year 2001 B. C., and Balak was king of the Moabites 1556 years B. C., 445 years after the birth of Moab. There is nothing then improbable in fixing the expulsion of the Emim from the country conquered by the Moabites for the year 1830, or 1828, B. C.; and since the Emim were among the ancient inhabitants of Yemen, they may have followed Esau, if, as I suppose, that patriarch invaded the territory of the Joktanidæ. Certainly it cannot be admitted to the Arabians, that the Emim dwelt in the south of Arabia, before the time when the sacred historian tells us that they were driven by the Moabites from the northern parts of that vast region.

9. The Amalekites are said by Abulfeda to have been descended from Amalek the son of Lud, and to have settled in Yemen after the confusion of languages. But this assertion seems to be founded on mere conjecture. The sons of Lud, the son of Shem, appear to have settled in Asia Minor; and it is generally thought that Lydia was named after the patriarch Lud. The same historian adds, that a portion of these Amalekites settled in Syria; and that from them sprang the Pharaohs

of Egypt. The author of the book called *Agan*, appears to have thought that the Amalekites had possessions in the province of Hejaz; and that the reason why so many Jews were found there was, because Moses had sent an army into Hejaz to extirpate the Amalekites. Now from these confused and erroneous statements, it would seem that a portion of the Amalekites had actually settled in remote times in the provinces of Yemen and Hejaz. But these Amalekites were not descended from Lud the son of Shem, but from Amalek the son of Eliphaz, the son of Esau. If then Esau invaded Yemen, and became master of that country, he might have been accompanied, or followed, by a portion of the family of his grandson Amalek.

10. The Arabians say that Isaac, in blessing Esau, prayed to God that he might be the progenitor of kings and emperors. They add, that Esau had a son called *Rom*, from whom sprang the princes of Greece and Italy. It is thus that they make out that Romulus derived his name from the son of Esau, and that Alexander the Great, called Dsu al Karnain, was descended from the same patriarch. They even pretend, as D'Herbelot mentions, that the Assyrian monarch Sennacherib sprang from the loins of Esau. The Idumæans and the Europeans are called by them *Banu Asphar*, sons of the *White*, meaning Esau or Edom, whose hair they suppose

to have been red, and his complexion fair. Now we may ask, for what purpose have all these absurd stories been invented, if not to conceal the truth? The inhabitants of Yemen pretend that they are pure Arabians, descended from Joktan. The other tribes hold that they are sprung from Ishmael. They say nothing of the descendants of Cham in the line of Cush—of the posterity of Abraham by Keturah—or of the numerous families which owe their origin to Esau. These they reckon not as Arabians. Thus it would never suit their notions of the purity of their Arabian blood, to admit that Esau might have established himself in Yemen. They endeavour, indeed, to represent him as the progenitor of princes, because they cannot deny that Idumæa belongs to Arabia; but they remember that he was deprived of the blessing which he claimed as due to his birthright, and they would reluctantly own descent from one, who had not been favoured of God as was his brother. Yet it is more natural to suppose that the Homeirites—*the Red people*—were descended from Edom—*the Red*—than that the posterity of that patriarch, acknowledged to have made expeditions, should have wandered to Europe, and, contrary to the testimony of all ancient historians, have given monarchs to Italy and Greece. May we not more easily believe, that the kings of Yemen were descended from Edom than the kings of Greece, when we find the Ara-

bians pretending on one side that Alexander the Great, certainly called Dsu al Karnain by his flatterers, was sprung from Esau, while they are obliged to admit on the other, that the title of Dsu al Karnain was first given to a king of Yemen?

11. It must be observed that I have been contending here for what I think a probability, not against history, but against tradition, and not only against tradition, but against prejudice. The Arabian writers plainly contradict the testimony of the Hebrew historian in various instances. Abulfeda, for example, tells us that Amalek was the son of Lud, and that his posterity settled in Yemen. In this manner he makes the Amalekites to be Ludim; and confounding these pretended Ludim, with the Ludim descended from Mitzraim, he says that the Pharaohs sprang from the Amalekites. Now it is certain that Amalek was the son of Eliphaz; and the Amalekites were consequently descended from Esau. A portion of their family seems to have settled in Yemen. But the truth was to be concealed, because all the inhabitants of Yemen wished to be represented as sprung from a more ancient, and as they seem to have thought, a more honourable race. When we meet with perversions of this kind, and many more might be cited, how can we give credit to the Arabian writers, or to the vaunted accuracy of their genealogies? The Arabians, like other Mussulmans, are not unacquainted

with the Pentateuch. They even highly reverence the Hebrew Scriptures. If then to satisfy their own prejudices —if to prove that they are all descendants either of Joktan, and consequently العرب العاربة *pure Arabians*, or of Adnan, and consequently العرب المستعربة *stranger. Arabians*, but of the blood of Ishmael—they venture to alter Scriptural genealogies, it may be easily supposed that they make little scruple in inventing what they please, where the sacred historian is silent.

There is nothing said in the Bible of Esau after he went to dwell in Mount Seir. He might in the course of a few years have changed his habitation. It indeed appears to me so little probable, that Edom, *Red*, ruled in one part of Arabia, where he was known by that Syriac name; while, known by an Arabic denomination, Homeir, *Red*, reigned in another part of that country; that I am inclined to think that the former migrated from the north to the south, where his name was translated from the Syriac into the Arabic dialect.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the Jorhamites, Chozaaites, and Korishites—of the kingdoms of Hira and Gassan—of the Hajarens and Saracens.

IN proposing to speak briefly of the subjects indicated in the title of the present chapter, it is by no means my intention to entangle either my readers or myself to any great extent in the mazes of Arabian genealogies. Neither shall I dwell long on doubtful questions of chronology, which, though they may force themselves on my notice, are beyond my ability to solve or to determine. It would serve no purpose to exhaust my own patience and that of others, in tracing the haunts of wandering barbarians; in vainly trying to ascertain the dates to which unlettered tribes refer their origin; or in collecting from uncertain records a list of names, to which no interest can be attached, and from

which no knowledge can be gathered. There are parts of the Arabian history as sterile as the sandy wastes of the Arabian territory; but an author may take advantages which a traveller can never enjoy; and may pass rapidly from one fertile region to another, without being compelled to advance step by step on his tedious way, or to remain longer than he pleases amidst the gloom of inhospitable deserts.

But with every wish to abridge the reader's labour and my own, it will be impossible for me to examine the questions proposed for enquiry in this chapter, without entering into some chronological and genealogical details. There can be no history where there is no chronology; and the history and chronology of the ancient Arabians are too often established on genealogies, for the accuracy of which tradition is the only voucher. In speaking therefore of the origin of the Arabian tribes, named in the title of the present chapter, discussions concerning the lineage of families become unavoidable. It will however be my endeavour to render them as brief as possible.

Jorham, according to Abulfeda, was the son of Joktan or Yoktan, whom the Arabians call Kahtan. He was consequently the brother of Yarab, of whom I have already spoken in a former chapter; and when Yarab mounted the throne of Yemen, Jorham founded a kingdom in the neighbouring province of Hejaz. Of these two brothers no notice is taken in Scripture. Some have thought that Jareh, or Yareh, and Jobab, or Yobab, settled in those regions of Arabia which have just been mentioned; and that the Arabians have made the name of Yarab out of those of Yareh and Yobab confounded together. (Gen. x. D'Herbelot, in voce Saba.) It would seem then that the Yarab and Jorham of the Arabians were the same with the Yareh and Yobab of Scripture. The name of Jorham (جرهم), however, bears no resemblance to any of those of the sons of Joktan enumerated in the book of Genesis.

Abulfeda proceeds to inform us that the sceptre of Hejaz continued to be swayed by the descendants of Jorham until the time of Modad the second, who, though the eleventh in suc-

cession, was only the seventh in descent, from the founder of the kingdom. During the reign of this prince, Ishmael, the son of Abraham, arrived in Hejaz, and espoused the daughter of Modad. It is much contested among historians, says Abulfeda, whether after this period the country were governed by the Ishmaelites, or whether it remained under the rule of the Jorhamites. Some insist that the government of the kingdom was retained by the latter; but that the former were entrusted with the keys of the sacred edifice, and were constituted the guardians of the temple. Others assert that Kaidar, the son of Ishmael, was acknowledged as king of Hejaz, and that the royal diadem was placed on his head by the uncles of his spouse. All writers are however agreed, continues Abulfeda, that the guardianship of the temple was confided to the Ishmaelites, and was still retained by them until the time of Nabet, when that trust was again restored to the descendants of Jorham.

The temple, of which Abulfeda speaks, was the famous *Kabah* (كعبة), or square edifice at

Mekkah, also called *Masgid* (مسجد) by the Arabians, and corrupted in our language into *mosque*. The Mahometans believe that this mosque was built by Abraham and Ishmael. But the period must have been short during which the guardianship of this temple was entrusted to the Ishmaelites. Abulfeda himself acknowledges, that it is not decided among the Arabians, whether Nabet were the son, the grandson, or the great-grandson, of Ishmael. To give any consistency, however, to this historian's account, we must suppose the Nabet of whom he speaks to have been different from the Nabet, or Nabaioth, mentioned in Scripture. There is indeed nothing improbable in the statement of Abulfeda, from which it would appear that the grandson of Kaidar bore the same name as his elder brother.

Various are the genealogies given of the descendants of Ishmael, who, according to different Arabian writers, succeeded each other in a direct line down to Adnan. Those, who can hope to derive either profit or pleasure from such researches, may consult Abulfeda and

Ibn Kotaiba; or abridge the labour by examining the tables of Eichhorn.

The Arabians believe, and some European authors assert, that the line of filiation from Adnan to Mahomet can be traced with certainty. Abulfeda recounts the history of this lineage; and enumerates not only all the progenitors of the prophet, but their brothers, nephews and cousins. Twenty generations are reckoned, both by this historian and by Ibn Kotaiba, between Adnan and Mahomet; and we may well marvel, how an exact account of these generations could have been preserved, until the time when the Arabians learned to write and to read. In some instances indeed Abulfeda appears to be perplexed by contradictory traditions; and the embarrassment of the pious Mussulman may perhaps excite an infidel smile, while he gives himself so much trouble to determine, whether a certain Kais were the son of a certain Ailan, or whether Ailan were the horse, or the dog, of Kais. These matters, however, as relating to the lineage of

their prophet, are considered as highly important by the Arabians.

It is with more surprise that I have found European writers admitting the accuracy of the lineage between Adnan and Mahomet. Thus that great master of the Arabian language, M. de Sacy, declares this genealogy to be incontestable. (Mem. de Litter. p. 533.) My faith in it, I must confess, is not quite so implicit as that of the learned Frenchman. Mahomet may possibly have been descended from a long line of noble ancestors; but it is difficult to believe that these could be counted back through twenty generations. Few are the nobles of Europe, with all the records and registers which they possess, who can trace the line of their progenitors during a period which can scarcely be calculated at less than 660 years. It may then be well questioned how this could be done in favour of the son of Abdallah, who gives himself the epithet of العمي *al omi, the ignorant,* and in whose family the arts of writing and reading seem to have been either neglected or unknown.

From the æra of the death of Nabet the Jorhamites continued to be the guardians of the Kabah, and were probably the rulers of the district round Mekkah, until the emigration of the Azdites (who retired from Saba with Amru, ben Amer, Mozaikia) caused several revolutions in Arabia, and proved fatal to the descendants of Jorham. The history of this last event has been related by Ibn Kotaiba and by Masudi. Several circumstances, recorded by Masudi, may be found in an extract from that writer, published by M. de Sacy (Mem. de Litter. p. 546); and as some of these circumstances are curious and important, we may wonder how the passage came to be omitted by Schultens, since it ought to have appertained to the *chabar sail el arim*, or history of the flood of the dykes, edited by that great Oriental scholar.

Amru, the son of Amer, surnamed Mozaikia, having retired from Yemen, shortly before the city of Saba was destroyed by the inundation, went in search of a place of residence, accompanied by his family, his friends, and the rest

of the tribe of the Azdites. This host of emigrants had passed into the kingdom of Hejaz, and there entered the territory of *Ali* (علي), according to Ibn Kotaiba; but Masudi names it the country of the *Sharûn* and *Ak* (الشريين وعك). Be this as it may, the historical fact remains the same, because the second son of Adnan, and the brother of Maad, is called Ali by some writers, and Ak by others. (Ibn Kotaiba, p. 152. Pococke, p. 46. Sacy, p. 494.) The king of this district, when Amru entered his territory, was called Samâlah, (Ibn Kotaiba, ibid.) and was apparently an Ishmaelite descended from Adnan. This prince gave permission to the strangers to take up their temporary abode in the region where was the well, or water of Gasan, between the rivers Zabid and Rama. (Masudi, p. 183.) Amru then sent three of his sons, Hareth, Malek, and Harethah, in search of a spot, where he and his followers might finally settle. But this prince died before the return of the emissaries; and was succeeded by his son Thalabah, who had remained with him. Soon after this event a certain Azdite,

Jadsa the son of Sanan, killed by stratagem Samalah, the king of the country, which nefarious action caused a war disastrous to the native inhabitants. But Thalabah, who was indignant at this conduct on the part of his own people, who had thus repaid the kindness of their hosts by an act of treason, swore that he would quit a territory, which, having been acquired by fraud, could not be retained without dishonour. He then departed with such adherents as chose to follow him, and arrived at Mekkah, where the Jorhamites still retained the superintendence of the temple. The Azdites proceeded from Mekkah to a neighbouring valley, called *Batn Mor*, and requested the Jorhamites to permit them to dwell there. The Jorhamites refused to accede to their demands, and a war ensued, in which the Azdites vanquished their enemies and obtained possession of Mekkah. (See Ibn Kotaiba, p. 154.)

It was at this epoch that the guardianship of the Kabah was confided to the Chozaaites. Much uncertainty prevails concerning the origin

of this tribe. The following is the account given by Masudi, in the extract made from that author by M. de Sacy :—*When Amrou, the son of 'Amer, and his children quitted Mareb, the children of Rebia left them, and went to dwell in Tehamah. They were named Chozaah, because they had separated themselves. But war having been kindled between Iyad and Modhar,* (I follow the orthography of M. de Sacy, but the names are written ايار and مضر in the original,) *sons of Nezar, and having proved unfortunate for Iyad, this last carried off the black stone, and buried it in a certain spot. A woman belonging to the Chozaaites was witness of this, and gave notice of it to those of her tribe, who obtained from the descendants of Modhar the promise that if they restored the black stone, they should obtain the superintendence of the Kaba. This was done; and the Chozaaites became in consequence superintendants of the temple. The first among them who exercised this function was Amrou, son of Lohai, son of Rebia, son of Haretha, son of Amer.* (De Sacy, p. 547.) I consider this filiation to have been misrepresented by the copyist: we should

read بن عمرو بن عمر *son of Amru, son of Amer;* and for بن لحي بن ربيعة—*son of Lohai, son of Rebiah* —بن لحي وهو ربيعة—*son of Lohai, who was the same as Rebiah.*

The author of the *Sirat al resoul*, quoted by M. de Sacy, says that, according to the genealogists of Modhar, the Khozaiites (as M. de Sacy writes the name) were descended from Elyas, who was the son of Modhar (or Modsar), and the fourth in descent from Adnan.

The question then is, whether the Chozaaites were descended from Joktan, as appears to have been the opinion of Masudi, or from Ishmael, as is affirmed by the genealogists of Modsar. In an extract made from a manuscript, attributed by M. de Sacy to Abulfeda, this writer states the uncertainty which exists concerning the origin of the Chozaaites; though he says that, according to the notion most commonly received, they came from Yemen. I observe also that Ibn Kotaiba, after having mentioned that the Azdites had expelled the Jorhamites out of Mekkah, adds, وولیت خزاعه البیت *and Chozaah superintended the temple.* Whence

we may conclude that this author held the same opinion as Masudi.

The Persian historians, Mirkhond and Khondemir (see D'Herbelot) give a very different account. They say nothing of the Chozaaite woman, who observed the Ishmaelite Iyad carry off and bury the black stone, one of the principal objects venerated in those times by the superstitious Arabians. They tell us, on the contrary, that Amru ben Hareth, chief of one of the most ancient tribes of the Jorhamites, having been compelled to cede Mekkah to the Ishmaelites, threw the black stone, and two golden antelopes, into the well called Zemzem. These precious objects were not discovered until the time of Abd al Motalleb, the grandfather of Mahomet.

But the testimony of the Arabian writers, already cited, is too clear to be misunderstood, and too positive to be rejected. Other authorities may be also quoted; and the reader may consult an extract from Abulfeda, translated by M. de Sacy (Mem. de Litter. p. 554); and the ancient verses attributed to Amru ben el

Hareth, together with a passage from Nuweiri, published by Schultens. (Monum. vetustior. Arab.)

Ibn Kotaiba (p. 157) says that the Chozaaites continued to rule at Mekkah, until Kosai drove them out of that city by the aid of Kisr, and of those who were with him. Kosai was an Ishmaelite and a Korishite, the great-grandfather of Abd al Motalleb, who has been mentioned above as the grandfather of the Prophet. This Kosai married the daughter of Holail, the Chozaaite, who was then superintendant of the Kabah; and after an appeal to force, and subsequently to arbitration, he succeeded to the office of his father-in-law. Thus was the guardianship of the temple of Mekkah transferred from the family of the Chozaaites to that of the Korishites. (See De Sacy, p. 555.)

Phahr, who was the tenth in descent from Adnan, and the eleventh in ascent from Mahomet, is said by some to have been the first who bore the name of Korish, or rather of Korsh (قرش); which name is interpreted *Bellua marina*

by Pococke. But according to Ibn Said, as reported by Abulfeda, the descendants of Phahr were not named Korishites until the time of Kosai, when they assembled together, and took possession of Mekkah. Hence the origin of the name of Korish is to be traced to قريشا *karisha*, which means a collection, or assemblage. Of these two derivations the latter is the less unreasonable, and therefore the more probable.

Masudi says that the life of Amru ben Lohai lasted during 345 years. This author clearly means that the dynasty, or the family, of this Amru, who was the first of the Chozaaites that had obtained the superintendence of the Kabah, continued to hold that situation during 345 years. But the same Amru was the son of Lohai, named Lohai Rebiah, son of Harethah, son of Amru ben Amer. (See De Sacy, p. 551.) We may then reckon at least 100 years to have elapsed between the departure of the Azdites from Saba under Amru ben Amer, and the epoch when his great-grandson became superintendant of the Kabah. But 345 years are

assigned to the period that Amru ben Lohai and the rest of the Chozaaites after him superintended this temple. Consequently these Chozaaites ceased to occupy this situation 445 years after the emigration of the Azdites, which happened immediately before the disaster occasioned by the *sail el arim*. The Chozaaites ceded their charge to Kosai, son of Kelab, the Korishite. Kosai was the grandfather of Hashem, the great-grandfather of Mahomet. We may then reckon the Korishites to have succeeded the Chozaaites in the administration of the Kaba 165 years before the birth of the Prophet; and we may, according to this calculation, fix the event of the *sail el arim* for the year 610 before the birth of Mahomet. But this mode of reckoning by generations, though commonly nearly correct, especially where the series is long, can never be attended with positive certainty; and in the present instance we may allow the possibility of error to the extent of ten, twenty, or even thirty years.

I am well aware, however, that I have still calculated a very different date for the destruc-

tion of the city of Saba by the *sail el arim,* from that proposed by M. de Sacy, who thinks that this event happened between the year 400, and the year 420, before the birth of the Arabian Prophet. But that part of my argument which is founded on the number of generations will hardly be deemed incorrect; and as to the period allowed by Masudi for the abode of the Chozaaites at Mekkah, I can only say, that since M. de Sacy has built so much on this writer's authority on other points, I can see no reason, why we should particularly doubt his accuracy, or reject his testimony, upon that in question. When he speaks of Amru ben Lohai as having lived for 345 years, he cannot be mistaken as meaning to speak also of his family, named the Chozaaites, as having remained guardians of the temple during that period. He says elsewhere, that the administration of the Kabah remained in possession of the Chozaaites, or descendants of Amru, during a term of 300 years. The superintendence of Amrū himself may have continued during 45 years. We have three generations to reckon of the descendants

of Amru ben Amer, namely, Harethah, Rebia or Lohai, and his son Amru—and four generations between Kosai (whose administration of the religious worship at Mekkah may have lasted 33 years) and Mahomet. These added together, and joined to the whole period of the administration of the Chozaaites, including that of Amru ben Lohai, may, I think, be fairly estimated, without insisting on absolute precision, at 610 years.

If, however, we reject the testimony of Masudi, and refer to the list of generations of the Chozaaites as given by Arabian authors, between Amru ben Lohai and Holail, we must come to a different conclusion. The number of generations between Amru ben Amer and Mahomet, reckoning Azdites, Chozaaites and Korishites, amounts only to 12; as will appear from the following list—Harethah, Lohai—Rebiah, Azdites—Amru, Kaab, Selul, Hobashiya, Holail, Chozaaites—Kosai, Abd-Menaph, Hashem, Abd al Motalleb, Abdallah, Korishites. Thus we should have to reckon only 396 years from Amru ben Amer to Mahomet. I cannot

then understand how M. de Sacy has come to fix the birth of Amru ben Lohai for the year 174 of the Christian æra.

But this genealogical testimony would be decisive against Masudi, who assigns 345 years for the duration of the Chozaaites alone, if it were indeed worthy of belief. The veracity of this evidence may, however, be well doubted. Since the Arabian authors cannot agree about the genealogies of their kings; since they contradict each other about the succession of generations in the royal lines of Homeir and Cahlan; and since they differ about the reigns, and even the names, of their sovereigns; they can scarcely be supposed to be better informed about families comparatively obscure. Sharestani says that Amru ben Lohai was contemporary with Sapor. *That will be* 400 *years before Islamism*, observes Abulfeda, *if he meant the son of Ardeshir; but he deceived himself much, if he spoke of Sapor Dsu al Aktaph, for there was a long interval between these two kings.* M. de Sacy says, *cette époque coïncide admirablement avec mon système.* But the reproach, for it is nothing less, which Abulfeda

addresses to Sharestani, seems to imply that this last writer had hazarded a synchronism, without distinctly knowing of what epoch, or of what persons, he was speaking. Pococke (p. 99) seems to have been of this opinion.

Masudi has imagined a very ingenious way of telling us what became of the followers of Amru ben Amer. The brother of this prince, named Amran, was a diviner. Before *the flood of the dykes* took place, and while Amru was preparing to depart from Saba, Amran dictated to the Azdites the different paths which they should pursue. *I have long foreseen,* said he to his auditors, *that you would be dispersed, and compelled to seek refuge in distant regions. Make your choice of the countries which you would wish to inhabit. Let the bold and hardy place themselves on the lofty citadel of Oman. Let those who still have courage, though they desire to avoid long and fatiguing journies, reside in the valley of Kud. They, who among you are prudent and patient, may retire to dwell in the deep vale of Mor. He, who would find plenty in the midst of sterility, may seek an abode in Yathreb, abounding with palm-trees. Let the man who*

would possess wine, and corn, and painted and silken garments, and who wishes to carry on commerce, proceed to Bosra and Owair in the land of Syria. But they who would acquire fine vestments and noble steeds, and who would gain great treasures, let them seek the country of Irak.

The first auditors, to whom Amran addressed himself, were afterwards known by the name of Azdites of Oman. The next were Wadiha, the son of Amru, and his companions, who settled in Hamedan. The third were the Chozaaites, who, under the conduct of Amru ben Lohai, separated themselves from their companions, and went to dwell in the valley of Mor, near Mekkah. The fourth were Al Aus and Al Chazraj, sons of Harethah, ben Thalabah, who fixed their residence at Medinah, anciently called Yathreb. The fifth were those who were afterwards established in Gasan in Syria. The sixth were Malak and his family, who finally settled in Hira, near the river Euphrates. (Masudi, p. 178.)

Those princes, whom the Arabians have styled kings of Hira and Gasan, ought rather to

be called satraps and præfects of the Persian and Roman emperors. (Pococke, p. 75.)

It seems to be generally agreed that Malak ben Phahm, was the first Arabian prince who ruled over the country of Hira, or Hirat. He quitted Mareb with Amru, whom he accompanied into the province of Hejaz, and afterwards proceeded to Hira, where he reigned for twenty years. But this dynasty was of short duration. Malak was succeeded by his brother; and at his death the throne was occupied by Jodsimah, the son of Malak. This prince was afflicted with leprosy, and was slain by Zoba, the daughter of Amru, of whom he was enamoured. The sceptre then passed into the family of Lachm, otherwise named Mondsar. Those, who wish to know more of Jodsimah, who was a drunkard, a libertine, and a tyrant, may consult Ibn Kotaiba. The reign of this voluptuous barbarian is said to have lasted for sixty years. (See Ibn Kotaiba, p. 178. Pococke, p. 68.)

It is by no means my intention to follow further the history of the kings of Hira, who

appear to have been mere vassals of the monarchs of Persia. A few remarks, however, concerning the duration of the kingdom of Hira may not be uninteresting to the chronologer.

Pococke reckons 24 kings of Hira, beginning with Malak, and ending with Mondar, or Mondsar, the son of Noman. As Malak quitted Saba with Amru ben Amer, we ought to be able nearly to ascertain the epoch of the *sail el arim*, if we could determine the duration of the kingdom of Hira. But since it appears from Ibn Kotaiba, that Malak accompanied Thalabah to Mekkah, and did not proceed to Irak, until after the Chozaaites, or rather the first of that family, had been put in possession of the Kaba, we must allow a long interval between the time when Malak departed from Saba, and the time when he established the kingdom of Hira. If he were a youth, when he left Saba with Amru ben Amer, we may admit this interval to have been 30 or 40 years.

Now Mahomet was born in the eighth year of the reign of Amru the third, the eighteenth

king of Hira; and this Amru and the five subsequent kings all died, as is well ascertained, during the life of the Prophet. We have therefore to count the period for 17 generations, and to add 8 years of the reign of Amru, in order to determine how long the kingdom of Hira had existed at the æra of the elephant, when Mahomet was born. Allowing 33 years for each generation, the sum in question will be 561+8 =569 years. Now this calculation agrees well with that of Ahmed, cited by Pococke, who assigns 622 years and 8 months for the whole period of the duration of the kingdom of Hira. It is true that Ahmed dates the beginning of the kingdom from the commencement of the reign of Amru ben Adi, ben Nadser, the successor of Jodsimah; but as it is clear from other historians, that there had been three, or at least two reigns before that of Amru ben Adi, we may take the computation for the whole series of kings, Malak and Al Mondsar included. Thus we shall have 53 years nearly for the reigns of Amru the third and his five successors, all of whom died during the lifetime of Mahomet; and

569 years for the period which preceded the birth of that Prophet, from the foundation of the kingdom of Hira. Neither does this calculation differ very materially from the statement of Ibn Dorid, cited by Reiske, who says that the *sail el arim*, or flood of the dykes, happened about six centuries before the æra of Mahomet; for if we allow 30 years to have elapsed from the departure of Malak from Yemen to the time when he founded the kingdom of Hira, we shall have 599 years between the emigration of the Azdites, and the birth of the Arabian Prophet.

M. de Sacy, following another method of reasoning, has fixed the æra, when the kingdom of Hira was founded, for the year 210 of the Christian æra—360 years before the birth of Mahomet. While every one must do justice to the patient labour which the author has employed in collecting his evidence to establish this point, I must avow for my own part that I am not satisfied with the proofs which have been adduced. M. de Sacy builds his argument principally upon a few synchronisms, which the Arabian historians pretend to establish between

some of the kings of Hira, and some of the Persian monarchs. But when we consider the evident ignorance which those historians betray of Persian chronology, little faith, I think, can be given to these pretended synchronisms. Nuweiri, on whose authority M. de Sacy seems greatly to rely, represents Rebia ben Modar as the successor of Amru ben Toba on the throne of Yemen; and relates that Rebia sent the son of his brother Jodsimah, and his own son Adi, with letters to Sapor Dsi el Aktaph, who assigned to them Hira and the circumjacent country. (p. 74.) The first part of this account may be questioned, since neither Hamza, nor Abulfeda, makes mention of a king of Yemen of the name of Rebia. The Sapor, of whom Nuweiri speaks, M. de Sacy will have to be Sapor the first; though I think the Arabians generally designate Sapor the second by the title of *Dsu el Aktaph*. But let the point be conceded to M. de Sacy. This synchronism then of Adi ben Rebia, who was the successor of Jodsimah on the throne of Hira, with Sapor the first, the son of Ardeshir, is the corner-stone

of M. de Sacy's system. Let us, however, shortly examine the merits of Nuweiri as a chronologer; and then judge of the value of his evidence. According to this author, Toba Asad succeeded to the crown of Yemen after his father Malkikarb. Hassan was the successor of his father Toba; and Amru, the younger son of Toba, slew his brother Hassan, and reigned after him. Rebia ben Modar succeeded Amru, and was the same who sent Adi with letters to Sapor Dsu al Aktaph, who, it is understood, is here meant for Sapor the first.

Now, without adverting to the very different account given by Abulfeda, let us observe, that only two generations, those of Toba Asad and his sons, intervened between Malkikarb and Rebia, who is designated as contemporary with Sapor the son of Ardeshir.

The reader will scarcely believe it possible, that this same Nuweiri, to whose evidence M. de Sacy appeals upon a chronological question, has committed the extraordinary errors, which I am about to cite from him. He asserts then, that Toba Asad made an expedition into India,

and killed with his own hand the son of Porus, who had been slain by Alexander. But I shall give Nuweiri's words from the version of Schultens, in case I should be suspected of having misrepresented his meaning:—*iter maximum ad Indiam intendit (scilicet Tobbaa), bellum ipsemet per se obiens. Adversus hunc eduxit filius Pori; cujus patrem interfecerat Alexander: eumque suamet manu interemit Tobbaa.* (Imp. Joct. ex Nuweirio, p. 65.) It will be remembered that Alexander defeated Porus 327 years before the Christian æra; and M. de Sacy himself has fixed the commencement of the reign of Toba Asad for the year 220 after Christ. I believe it to have been at an earlier period than M. de Sacy has named, that Toba wore the crown of Yemen. But this is nothing to the present purpose. Nuweiri represents Toba Asad as contemporary with the son of that Porus, who was vanquished by Alexander the Great; at the same time that he makes Rebia, the successor of the second son of Toba, contemporary with Sapor the first, who mounted the throne of Persia in the year 238 of the Christian æra.

We find another portentous anachronism almost immediately following that which I have just stated. Nuweiri says, on the authority of one of his guides, that Toba Asad was the contemporary of Kobad the son of Phiruz; that Toba sent his nephew Shamar to make war against this Persian monarch; and that Shamar took him and slew him. Now this Kobad mounted the throne in the year 491 after Christ, and 220 years after the death of Sapor the first, whom Nuweiri has called the contemporary of Rebia, who succeeded Amru the son of Toba Asad.

According to M. de Sacy, Jodsimah (or Djodhaima, as he writes the name) succeeded Malak on the throne of Hira in the year 230 of the Christian æra. Jodsimah, according to Nuweiri, was contemporary with Rebia. But this author fixes the æra of the *sail el arim* for the reign of Toba Alakran in Yemen. Alakran was succeeded by Asad ibn Amru; Asad by Morthid; Morthid by his four sons, who reigned together; these by their sister Absaga; Absaga by Malkikarb; Malkikarb by Toba Asad;

Toba Asad by his son Hassan; Hassan by his brother Amru; and Amru by Rebia. Of the numerous reigns between Alakran and Rebia, Nuweiri mentions that of Morthid to have lasted 40 years, and that of Malkikarb 20 years. He leaves us to guess the length of the other reigns. Considering the many important expeditions, which took place under the reign of Toba Asad, we cannot estimate it at less than 20 years; and if we assign 20 years more for the reigns of Asad ibn Amru, the children of Morthid, of Hassan and his brother Amru, we shall scarcely be accused of exaggeration. But we shall thus have 100 years between the reigns of Alakran and Rebia; and we cannot in consequence allow a shorter period between the event of the *sail el arim*, which Nuweiri says happened in the time of Alakran, and the commencement of the reign of Jodsimah in Hira, than 110 years. This inference is clear, both because the *sail el arim* happened before the death of Alakran, and because Jodsimah was sent, while yet young, into Hira by Rebia, after this last had mounted the throne of Yemen.

Now M. de Sacy fixes the date of the *sail el arim* between the years 150, and 170, after Christ. Let us say that it was the year 160 after Christ. The same writer thinks that the death of Malek took place in the year 230; and that, (contrary to the statement of Ibn Kotaiba,) he was succeeded in the same year by his son Jodsimah. It is clear, however, that according to Nuweiri this reckoning cannot be sustained. M. de Sacy would make an interval of only 70 years between the *sail el arim* and the death of Malek. But I have clearly shown, that if Nuweiri be accurate in stating that the *sail el arim* happened in the time of Alakran, we cannot count less than 110 years between that event, and the time when Jodsimah mounted the throne.

Thus Nuweiri appears to be no very useful ally to M. de Sacy. But the marvel is that this learned man should have sought for such an ally as Nuweiri, in order to support his chronological system. He must have well known that this same Nuweiri had represented Toba Asad as contemporary with the son of Porus, who

lived 300 years before Christ, and with Kobad, who lived 500 years after Christ.

It seems difficult to account for the origin of the name of Gasan (غسان) in Syria, since we have already seen that the Azdites stopped at the water of Gazan, when they quitted Yemen, and entered Hejaz. Perhaps the Azdite chief, who finally settled in Syria, had received this as a surname, because he had come from the place called Gasan in Hejaz, and had again given this denomination to his new abode. In a manuscript copy of Masudi, M. de Sacy found a passage, which he has thus translated into French. *Ensuite la famille de Salih étant venue en Syrie, vainquit les Tenoukhites, embrassa le Christianisme, et reçut des Romains le gouvernement de tous les Arabes établis en Syrie. Apres cela plusieurs tribus du Yemen se dispersèrent à l'occasion de ce qui arriva à Mareb, et de l'aventure d'Amrou ben Amer Mozaïka. Gassan vint alors en Syrie.* He afterwards says, *Gassan est le nom d'une eau dont elles (les tribus) burent, et dont elles reçurent cette dénomination. C'est une eau entre Zabid et Zama, au pays des Ascharis, dans le*

Yemen. On dit qu' Amrou ben Amer, étant sorti de Marcb, demeura près de cette eau jusqu'à sa mort.

From this account, it might be supposed that Gasan was in Yemen, and that Amru had never quitted that country. But Masudi, in another place, Nuweiri, and Ibn Kotaiba, all say that Amru went out of Yemen.

The kingdom of Gasan was founded therefore some years later than that of Hira, by a tribe of the Azdites, who had quitted Mareb with Amru ben Amer, and who settled in a district which is situate to the south-east of Damascus. But this country was then in the possession of other Arabians, who appear to have been already resident there during several generations, and who counted six kings, or chiefs, who had governed them in succession before the arrival of the Azdites, who raised one of their own tribe to the throne. It was then that the kingdom received the name of Gasan, or Gassan. The kings of Gasan, however, were never independent sovereigns; and can only be considered as præfects of the Roman emperors.

We find much confusion and uncertainty in the accounts which the Arabian writers have given us of the duration of this little kingdom. According to Nuweiri it lasted 616 years, under 37 successive reigns. This author probably confused the kings of the first Arabian possessors of Gasan with the kings raised to the throne by the Azdites. Abulfeda tells us that according to some this kingdom lasted 400 years, and according to others 600 years. Nuweiri represents Hareth, the son of Amru ben Amer, as the first king; but the name of Japhnah appears first on the list of Abulfeda. This last historian reckons 31 kings, but only 18 generations, between Japhnah the first king, and Jehabal the last king. This difference between the number of reigns, and the number of generations, is accounted for by several brothers having succeeded each other. They more probably reigned together at the same time. Jehabal, the last king of Gasan, abdicated the throne in the time of the Kaliph Omar, who succeeded Abu Beker in the year 634 of the Christian æra, two years after the death of Mahomet. It was in the same year

that Omar vanquished the Romans in Syria, and took possession of Damascus, and with it the district of Gasan. Counting, as usual, 33 years for each generation, we shall have 594 years between Japhnah and Jehabal. The former, who was the son of Thalabah, the son of Amru ben Amer, seems to have established his kingdom by the sword, and may have been well advanced in life before he succeeded in his enterprize. The latter may not have reigned long, when he was compelled to resign the sceptre. If then we take the number of generations, as enumerated by Abulfeda, and the period assigned to the monarchy by Nuweiri, there appears nothing improbable in the calculation. The whole period of the duration of the kingdom being estimated at 616 years; 22 years being assigned to the reigns, which we suppose to have been short, of Japhnah and Jehabal; we may safely reckon 594 years for the 18 generations between those two princes. We may then fix the commencement of the kingdom of Gasan under Japhnah for the year 18 of the Christian æra, 552 years before the birth of Mahomet, and

17 years after the establishment of the kingdom of Hira under Malak.

But in thus discussing the subject of these dates, I by no means wish to be understood as speaking with the conviction of certainty. To endeavour to arrive at an approximation to the truth is all that ought to be desired, because it is really all that we can obtain, in such investigations as those which I have been making. The evidence of the Arabians themselves is so confused and discordant, concerning the epoch of the *sail el arim*, and consequently concerning all the epochs of the events which resulted from that calamity, that strangers are necessarily left to choose between assertions and contradictions, and to extract what meaning they can from obscure, perplexed, and contending traditions. At the same time this question is still most important to those, who desire to be acquainted with the ancient history of Arabia. No progress can ever be made in the knowledge of Arabian chronology, before the existence of Islamism, until a date, at least probable, be assigned to the deparuret of the Azdites from Yemen, and to the

eruption of the waters of the great reservoir, which caused the destruction of the city of Saba. I am inclined, for my own part, to place these events, in round numbers, at about 600 years before the birth of Mahomet; but I leave the reader to decide the question for himself; and to consult, if he please, the learned observations which have been written on this subject by Reiske, Gosselin, and De Sacy.

I should far exceed the limits which I have proposed to myself in this chapter, were I to speak of the origin of various other ancient tribes, of which the memory is still preserved in Arabia. There are, however, two races, of which the names are famous in Oriental story, and concerning which it may not be irrelevant to the general scope of my enquiries to make a few remarks—I mean the Hajarens and Saracens.

Latissime, says Scaliger, *patet Arabum appellatio, quorum unum nomen, cognomina autem infinita. Sed præcipuè sunt Hagareni et Saraceni. Hagareni enim ab Hebræis dicuntur* הגרים, *ab ancilla Saræ, uxoris Abrahami, et ab Arabibus ipsis* عرب

الهجرب *Arab-El-Hagiari. Dicuntur etiam* المهجربين *Elmagarin.* (De Emend. tempor. L. 2.) Assemani has likewise said, (vol. iii. p. 555.) in speaking of the Ishmaelites, *dicti sunt etiam Hagareni, ab Hagar matre Ismaëlis.* According to Aben Ezra, however, the Hagarens were not Ishmaelites—*sunt isti Hagareni, quos genuit Hagar ex viro alio, et non ex Abrahamo.* (Comment. in psalm. 82.) I must object to this etymology, because I know of no example, from which it would appear, that any of the Arabian tribes have ever traced their origin to a female. Neither can I find any proof, from which it can be argued, that the Ishmaelites were ashamed of their patriarch, and chose to be known rather as the descendants of Hagar than of her son. With regard to the assertion of Aben Ezra I can only say, that as it is unsupported by any authority, it cannot be allowed to be of any weight. It is clear, however, from the passage in the psalm, on which Aben Ezra makes his comment, that the Ishmaelites and Hagarens were distinguished from each other by the sacred writer. But we are not thence to

conclude with Aben Ezra, that Hagar had children by another than Abraham, and that her descendants were named Hagarens. The Hebrew canon, משפחת אם אינה משפחת—*familia matris non est familia*—applies to the Arabians as well as to the Jews; though Hottinger, who cites this canon, attempts to set aside its authority.

Hottinger, however, has justly corrected the error of Scaliger, who has confounded the Hajaren Arabians—عرب الهجرب—with the *El Mahagiarin*—المهجريين.* The latter name was given to the fugitives, who accompanied Mahomet in his flight from Mekkah to Medinah, at the epoch of the Hegirah. The former had received their denomination many ages before the time of Mahomet. In the psalm, to which I have already referred, mention is made of the Hagarens, called הגרים, *Hagarim*, in the original. The same people are denominated הגראים *Hagaraim*, and הגרי *Hagari*, in the book of Chronicles. (v. xi. and xxvii.)

I think then that there can be little doubt, that the *Hagari*, mentioned in Scripture, were

the same whom Strabo (L. 16.) and Ptolemy (L. 5.) designate by the name of Ἀγραῖοι, *Agraioi*. According to both these authors the Agraioi inhabited Arabia Petræa; and in the book of Chronicles the Hagari are represented as having dwelt in tents in the whole region which lies to the east of Galaad.

It is rather singular therefore, that it occurred to none of the learned writers whom I have cited, that the هجريين *Hajarin*, or people whose names are variously written *Hagarens*, and *Agarens*, and *Hagiarens*, may have been so denominated, as inhabiting the region named from هجر *Hajar*, or *Hagiar*, its principal city. The ancient Arabic name of the city, which the Greeks and Romans called *Petra*, was *Hagiar*, or *Hajar*, which likewise signifies a rock, or stone. The Arabians, however, assign a much greater extent to the province of Hajar, than the classical writers have given to Arabia Petræa. *Hajar*, says Abulfeda, *est nomen universæ regionis Bahrain verum ac proprium.* The author of the Mostarek includes in his description of this country both Sham and Irak.

As some authors have been pleased to derive the name of the Hajarens from Hagar, the concubine of Abraham, others have imagined that the Saracens so denominated themselves, because they pretended to be the descendants of Sarah, the lawful wife of Abraham. Jerom (ad Ezech. xxv.) charges the *Agareni* with this absurd pretension. Isidorus (Orig. L. 9.) says, *Ismaël, filius Abrahami, a quo Ismaëlitæ, qui nunc corrupto nomine Saraceni, quasi a Sara, et Agareni ab Agar.* I have not seen these assertions confirmed by the testimony of any Arabian writer.

Scaliger derives the name of the Saracens from سرق *sarak*, to steal. Thus, according to this great critic, Saracen is equivalent to thief. Pococke, without naming Scaliger, asks, *a quibus hoc nomen Saracenis inditum? Non ab ipsis,* continues he, *qui famæ suæ pepercissent: sin ab aliis, sua potius lingua, quam Arabum, quibus hoc ad opprobrium sonat, locuturos fuisse credibile est.* It is likewise to be observed, that the Saracens, a fierce and warlike people, were more likely to be called robbers and spoliators than thieves.

Every language makes a distinction between the robber and the thief, because there is a real distinction between him who takes what is not his own by force, and him who takes it by fraud.

Bochart (L. 4. c. 2.) holds the same opinion with Scaliger; and adds, that the Arabians never adopted the name of Saracens, which was given to them by their neighbours. But in this case, their neighbours would have called them *thieves* in their own language.

Pococke derives Saracen from شرقي *sharki, orientalis;* and mentions, on the authority of Firauzabadi, that there are some villages in Arabia called *Sharakah* and *Sharakiah.* He might have cited the words of Stephanus Byzantinus, who says, Σάρακα, χώρα Ἀραβίας μετὰ τοὺς Ναβαταίους· οἱ οἰκοῦντες Σαρακῆνοι—*Saraka, a region of Arabia beyond the Nabataioi: the inhabitants Saracens.*

But it is to be observed, that there was another tribe of Saracens, mentioned both by Pliny (L. 6.), and by Ptolemy (L. 5.), that inhabited Arabia Felix. Now it is difficult to understand how

the Saracens either of Arabia Felix, or of Arabia Petræa could be called Orientalists. The former dwelt in the interior of the country, to the south of the Scenitæ, and apparently in the province of Hejaz, and on the borders of Yemen. From whom were they to receive the appellation of Orientalists? The situation of the latter is described by Ptolemy, who, in speaking of Arabia Petræa, informs us *that there were in that country mountains, called the black mountains, which extended, from the bay which is near Pharan, to Judæa; and that to the west of those mountains to Egypt were the Saracens.* (L. 5.) By what Arabians were these Saracens to have been so called, if Saracens be equivalent to Orientalists?

Both the preceding etymologies are to be rejected. No people ever gave either to their country, or to themselves, an opprobrious name. We have seen from Ptolemy, that the Saracens of Arabia Felix inhabited a country farther south than the Scenitæ, so called by the Greeks from their living in tents. The Scenitæ were therefore the tribes of the desert, called by modern writers the Beduin Arabs. But the Beduins

are the only Arabians, who deserve to be designated as robbers; and the appellation of thieves would be even ill applied to those daring plunderers of caravans, who when they propose to rob, are always prepared to fight. The Saracens, however, who dwelt to the south of the desert, and consequently in a fertile region, were little likely to be stigmatised by the dishonourable name of سرقيين *sarakiin*, or thieves. A similitude of sounds cannot justify an improbable etymology. The Saracens of Arabia Petræa were indeed Beduins; were lawless robbers; and were ἐρημόνομοι καὶ ἀδέσποτοι, ungoverned freebooters of the desert; but it does not thence follow that they called the region where they dwelt from a word that signifies to steal, or that they either took, or received, the name of thieves. Every country is called by the name which is given to it by its inhabitants. The country in which the Saracens dwelt was called Saraka, as we have seen from Stephanus Byzantinus. Had this appellation borne the sense attributed to it by Scaliger and Bochart, it would never have been adopted by the people of the country.

The explanation given by Pococke is equally inadmissible. It is clear from Ptolemy's account, that the region in Arabia Petræa, which Stephanus Byzantinus calls Saraka, was situate on the western side of the Black mountains, next to Egypt, and consequently comprehended the district on the Red sea, between the bays of Kolsum and Akabah, the most western part of all Arabia. How can it be imagined that this district would have been called Saraka, if that name had signified the east? The Arabians, it may be presumed, denominated the district *Belad el Saraka*, the region of Saraka; but they surely never could have given it this appellation, if *Belad el Saraka* had been equivalent to the region of the east. The Anglo-Saxons did not give the name of Essex to Cornwall.

Mr. Gibbon (c. 50.) says that the denomination of Saracens was given by strangers; and that therefore the origin of the name must not be sought in the Arabic, but in a foreign language. This celebrated writer neglects to point out a language, to which the name can be traced. I will venture to say that this foreign language

can be neither Persian, nor Chaldaic, nor Hebrew, nor Syriac, nor Coptic, nor Greek, nor Latin. Besides, there is no proof whatever that the denomination of Saracens was given to that people by strangers. What strangers could have thus named the Saracens, who dwelt in the interior of Arabia Felix? What foreigners would have thought of calling a district of Arabia Petræa by the name of Saraka, if the people of the country had not already given it that denomination? The Greeks and Romans, it is true, frequently imposed new names on the provinces and cities which they had conquered; but they would hardly have bestowed a new and barbarous denomination, which had no connexion with their own languages, on the inhabitants of a district of Arabia Felix, of which they never were the masters.

It appears then, that it is in the Arabic language only that we ought to seek for the origin of the name in question.

It will be remembered that when Amru ben Amer and the Azdites who were with him quitted Yemen, they halted at the water of

Gasan. Amru died there. The subsequent conduct of the Azdites, and the departure of Thalabah, have been already related. I have also stated that the result of the war, which was kindled between the Azdites and the native inhabitants of the country, proved disastrous to the latter. These were the descendants of *Ashar*, *Alshar*, or *Shar*, and were called *Shariin*, in the plural form, who had united themselves to the descendants of Ak. Ibn Hesham, quoted by the author of the Sirat al Resul, says, Ak established himself in Yemen, (more probably in Hejaz, on the borders of Yemen,) and married among the Shariin, and remained with them; but the Shariin were the descendants of Ashar. (De Sacy, Mem. p. 494.) An ancient poet, likewise cited by the author of Sirat al Resul, mentions, that all the descendants of Ak were expelled from the country of Gasan—

وعك ابن عدنان الذين تلعبوا
بغسان حتي طردوا كل مطرد

And Ak, the progeny of Adnan, who disported in Gasan, until they were all expelled.

But if the inhabitants all fled, which is scarcely probable, they left their name behind them; and,

as we see from Masudi, the country was still called the country of the Shariin and Ak. I ought to observe, that the progenitor of the Shariin was called *Shar*, according to Al Firauzabadi, *quod cum nasceretur*, شعر عليه, *pilosus fuerit*. (Pococke, p. 46.)

Now it seems not improbable to me, that the descendants of Shar and Ak, being united in one tribe, might have been called شعرعكيين *Sharakiin*. Those who fled from their country, after the defeat which they had received from the Azdites, might have settled in Arabia Petræa. But I offer this etymology as a mere conjecture. We may say with more certainty, that the Saracens, little known at the commencement of the Christian æra, soon obtained celebrity; and it may be interesting shortly to enquire, how the name of Saracen came at last to be nearly synonymous in Europe with that of Arabian.

It appears, from the statement cited above from Ptolemy, that the Saracens of Arabia Petræa were only separated from Palestine by the Black mountains. I have admitted that these

Saracens were a fierce and uncivilized people, and that they were robbers like all the other Beduin Arabs. After the conquest of Judæa, by the Romans, and while that country continued to be torn by domestic divisions, as well as oppressed by foreign rulers, it was exposed to the prædatory incursions of the Saracens. Jerom (ad Jerem. iii.) tell us, that, even down to his time, these barbarians infested the borders of Palestine. Neither can it be supposed that the Christians, who first passed into Arabia for the purpose of spreading the light of the gospel among the idolaters of Hejaz and Yemen, and whose nearest road was through the country of the Saracens, escaped unmolested by those vagabonds of the desert. Their proximity to Egypt on one side, and to Judæa on the other, must have rendered their name notorious in both of those countries, and must have brought them in frequent contact with the missionaries of the church, who travelled between Jerusalem and Alexandria, or who crossed the desert in their way from this last city to Petra, where at an early period they had made many converts.

(Assemmani, vol. 3. p. 590.) It is mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. L. 6.), that a numerous body of Christians, who had fled from the persecution excited against them in Judæa, and who had taken refuge on a mountain in Arabia, were made captives ὑπὸ βαρβάρων Σαρακηνῶν— by barbarous Saracens. This act of violence must have been soon made known to the whole Christian world; and the recollection of such a misdeed was not likely to be forgotten by men, who were still struggling for the maintenance of their religious opinions against the power and perversity of the Roman emperors.

Hence did the Saracens, though not more numerous, and probably not more rapacious, than many other tribes of Beduin Arabs, obtain more general notice, and a worse celebrity. By their geographical situation they were placed at the gate of Arabia, by which that country is most easily entered from Judæa and from Egypt. Their name was probably the first, which the Egyptian, the Jew, or the Christian, heard, when he proposed to travel to Mekkah or to Sana.

Thus in the first ages of Christianity did the name and character of the Saracens become notorious in Palestine and Europe; and the name of this tribe came by degrees to be given alike to all the wandering hordes that pitch their tents in the desert from Ailah to Basra. Finally, the nations of the West wholly confounded the denominations of Saracens and Arabians; and when these last extended the empire of their kaliphs from India to the Columns of Hercules, the Europeans still called them Saracens, probably unconscious of any error, and perhaps without meaning any reproach.

CHAPTER V.

The Arabian Pantheon.

TSABAISM was the religion of the ancient Arabians. Of this religion I have often had occasion to speak in the present work; but it may not be unprofitable to the reader, that I give a fuller account of it than I have yet done, before I introduce him into the Arabian Pantheon.

Much difference of opinion exists concerning the origin of the name of the Tsabeans, or Tsabaists. Some writers suppose the Tsabeans to have been so denominated from Saba the son of Cush. Others refer the origin of this sect to Saba the son of Joktan. But these authors have to contend against the received ortho-

graphy.[1] M. Fourmont says, that according to Sharestani, *Sabi* or *Sabian* is derived from *saba*, which signifies, *to deviate from the true religion;* but, adds M. Fourmont, it is objected to him, that this verb is rather Syriac than Arabic. This objection does not appear to me to be of any weight. The Arabians might have adopted a Syriac word; especially as the Syrians spoke a dialect, which bore a strong affinity to their own. There can be no doubt, however, that the etymology proposed by Sharestani is untenable. The early Mahometans probably used the word *saba* as signifying, *to profess the religion of the Tsabeans;* and by a Tsabean the first disciples of Islamism may have easily understood a person alienated from what they called the true religion. But Tsabaism, it will be re-

[1] It is difficult to make this difference of orthography apparent to the English reader, because the Roman *s* is generally employed to express both the Arabic characters س and ص. I only venture to write Tsabean for Sabean, because I derive the word, as will shortly appear, from the Hebrew צבא *tsaba*.

collected, had existed in Arabia for many ages before the time of Mahomet; and its numerous followers were known as such even immediately before the time of the Prophet, when their religion was not likely to be stigmatised as false, or themselves as apostates. The most probable derivation of the name in question is generally thought to be from צבא *tsaba*, *exercitus*. The Tsabeans appear to be the same with those designated in Scripture as worshippers of the hosts of heaven. It may even be argued, that the Mahometans themselves admit this etymology, since there are still some among them who are called *Sabin*, who mix the superstitions of the Tsabeans with the creed of Mussulmans, and who venerate the celestial bodies with little less than religious respect. (Cod. Mss. Orient. Bib. Pal. Med. p. 280.)

The traditions of the nations of the East refer the origin of this worship to the antediluvians. Ibn Amidi says, that Tsabaism was instituted by Seth the son of Adam. (Pococke, p. 142.) According to Ibn Shahna, cited by Hyde

(p. 127), the Tsabeans are said to have received their religious doctrines from Seth and from Edris or Idris. Kessæus tells us, that Edris was the first who, after Enoch the son of Seth, wrote with a pen; that he taught his sons the art of writing, and that he addressed them in the following terms—*Know, O my sons, that you are Sabians. Learn therefore to read in your youth, that this may turn to your profit in old age!* There is some ambiguity in the original, and apparently a play on the word صبيون *sabiun*. Edris (if we choose to believe that he spoke in Arabic) might mean to call his sons Sabians, as signifying either young men, or descendants of Sabi, the son of Seth, or believers in the faith of the Tsabeans. It is not quite easy to decide who this Edris was. Kessæus, as we have just seen, places him after Enoch; but Beidavi and Elmakin say that he was the same with Enoch. The Tsabeans pretended, as we are told by Beidavi, that their religion was similar to that which was professed by Noach. On the absurdity of this pretension it is needless to expatiate.

Without enquiring further, whether astrolatry were introduced or not, among men before the deluge, there can be little doubt of its wide extension in a very few ages after that event. To the truth of this statement not only all the traditions of the nations of the East, but all the remains of their ancient mythology, bear ample testimony. No author has treated the subject before us with more ability than Rab. Moses Maimonides, who has shown that Tsabaism was the universal religion of mankind when Abraham received his call.

In turning our attention to Arabia, we can scarcely be surprised that the Chamites introduced heliolatry and astrolatry into that country. Oriental tradition rings with the apostacy of Cham. The Rabbin are not among the last to charge this patriarch with idolatry. R. Hannasse says, that Cham introduced the art of fabricating idols; and adds, ולמד אנשי שפחתו העבדת האש, *and he taught the men of his family the worship of fire.* Various descendants of Cush, the eldest son of Cham, were established in Arabia. (Bochart, L. 4.) Aben Ezra, speaking of the Cushites, says, הכושיים הם עבדים בעו בעבור שקלל

נח את חם—*the Cushites were servants indeed, because Noach cursed Cham.* Some have understood the meaning to be, that the Cushites were idolaters; and Kircher has translated the passage—*Cusii cultores fuere idolorum, eo quod Noë Chamo maledixit.* I speak from memory, when I say that Lactantius, one of the most learned and eloquent of the Latin Fathers, has not hesitated to stigmatise Cham and his descendants as idolaters. Didymus Alexandrinus asserted, that Zoroaster was no other than Cham the son of Noach—τὸν *Ζωροάστρην μηδένα ἄλλον ἢ τὸν Χὰμ υἱὸν Νῶε εἶναι.*

It is less easy to account for the very early introduction of Tsabaism into those parts of Arabia which were peopled by the descendants of Shem. Tradition, which has branded Cham as an apostate and an idolater, has always respected the memory of his brother. The words, which the Arabians pretend were addressed by Noach to Shem, are thus reported by Kessæus: —*O Sem, thou didst cover the nakedness of thy father! May God protect thee in this world, and pardon thee in the next!* It seems then extraor-

dinary, that in the course of a few generations the descendants of this righteous patriarch should have fallen into the same errors as those, into which Cham is said to have been betrayed. Saba, the great-grandson of Joktan, was known, according to Abulfeda, by the surname of Abd Shems, servant of the Sun; and we are told by Abulfaraj, that Homeir, or Himyar, was a worshipper of that luminary.

We know the Tsabeans by this name, which is derived from the Hebrew, or perhaps the old Arabic, word *tsaba*, a host; but the sect was not confined to the countries between the Euphrates and the Nile; and their doctrines, as Maimonides argues, were probably extended over all the civilized nations of the earth. We may therefore conclude, that the Tsabaism of the Arabians resembled that of their neighbours. This indeed is clearly expressed by Thabet Ibn Corrah, who says, *illud quod de Sabiis certo accepimus est, esse professionem ipsorum eandem cum Chaldeorum antiquorum professione.* (Pococke, p. 142.) Now of the religious doctrines of the ancient Chaldeans we can at least form a general

estimate, by the aid of various writers, whose evidence I shall proceed to cite, and endeavour to abbreviate.

It is necessary, however, previously to remark the observation of Sharestani, who states, that a distinction is to be made *inter Sabios colentes stellas, et Sabios colentes imagines.* Thus the ancient inhabitants of Iran worshipped the Sun, but offered no adoration to images; while the Chaldeans and Syrians fabricated innumerable idols, which they reverenced as the representatives of the Sun, and Moon, and the rest of the host of heaven. They likewise devised emblems of the several elements, and symbols of the powers of nature, and of the attributes of their deities, which they consecrated, and honoured with religious veneration.

According to the account of Maimonides, as given in the More Nevoachim, the Tsabeans acknowledged the existence of a supreme God. This mighty and ineffable Being they supposed to dwell in eternal glory, inaccessible, and invisible. Innumerable spiritual natures had emanated, it was imagined, from the divine essence;

and these, in countless myriads, peopled the universe, and ministered to the will, as they were instructed by the wisdom of the Deity. The sun and the stars were first considered as the emblems of God, and of the angels who govern the world, and who preserve the order of nature, under the controul of their omnipotent King. In process of time, however, the types came to be mistaken (at least by the populace) for the prototypes. The invisible God was forgotten, with all the spiritual agents that execute his will; and the stars and the elements, unconscious of the honour, were elevated to the rank of deities by the degraded understandings and the misguided imaginations of men.

I now propose to consider the doctrines of the Tsabeans; *first*, with respect to God; *secondly*, with respect to those subordinate spiritual beings, that were considered as the ministers and messengers of the Deity; and, *thirdly*, with respect to the visible types of these invisible essences.

1. From the statement which has been made above, it is obvious that the Tsabaists, even

though they may have had erroneous notions of the manner in which the universe is governed, yet entertained very exalted ideas of the power and majesty of the Deity. It may, however, still be questioned, whether they considered God as a purely intellectual Being, and as the primary Cause of all existence. No theological system can be admitted as genuine, which does not recognise intellect as the primordial principle; and which does not acknowledge God as the Creator of the universe, who has given existence to all other beings, whether spiritual or material.

We are told that, according to the primitive and orthodox faith of the ancient Persians, that people adored one eternal Principle of good; in other words, one eternal beneficent God. (Hyde, p. 161.) Moshin Phani has dwelt at great length on the pure theism of these ancient Persians, whom he designates as Yezdadians. (Dabistan, p. 1. et seq.) We are informed by Eusebius (Pr. Ev. L. 1), that Zoroaster, speaking of the Agathodæmon, who was represented with the body of a serpent and the head of a hawk,

said word for word (φησὶ κατὰ λέξιν), *He is first, incorruptible, eternal, unbegotten, without parts, unlike to all other beings, &c.* The doctrines of the priests of Chaldea, except on the subject of image-worship, greatly resembled those of the Persian Magi. (See Laertius and Hesychius in voce Χαλδαῖος.) A Greek writer says, in explaining the dogmas of the Chaldeans, μίαν ἀρχὴν τῶν πάντων δοξάζουσι—*they think there is one principle of all things.* Eusebius, in the 5th chapter of the 4th book of his Evangelical Preparations, gives an account of Greek theology, which he should rather have called Chaldean. We there find that the Greeks, or rather the Chaldeans, acknowledged a first and supreme Being, the God, Father, and King of all things. Neither, if we believe Sharestani, did the Tsabeans of Arabia fail to recognise the unity of the Deity. (Pococke, p. 148.) But in spite of these authorities it may be questioned, whether the nations professing Tsabaism could have been acquainted with the true principles of theism.

According to Plutarch (De Is. et Osir.) the Persians believed in the existence of two Gods,

the one good, and the other evil. This doctrine, adds Plutarch, was taught by Zoroaster, who called the first of these deities Oromasdes, and the second Arimanius. From objects falling under the notice of the senses, the former was said to resemble light, and the latter darkness. The middle between these, continues the same author, was Mithras, to whom the Persians gave the appellation of the Mediator. Ibn Shahna, an Arabian writer cited by Hyde (p. 162), makes apparently a different statement. The Persians, says he, acknowledged a certain eternal Deity, whom they called Yezdan, designing by him *Allah;* and also another Deity created out of darkness, whom they named Ahriman, that is to say, Eblis (or the Devil). Hence they praised the light; worshipped fire; and avoided darkness. Nor did they cease to do so, until Zerdusht proclaimed his prophetic mission. Thus they asserted the existence of God the Creator, who was sole, and without any companion. They likewise held, that this Deity created light and darkness; that good and evil are produced out of the mixture of light and

darkness; *that if these two were not mixed, the world could not exist;* and that they will continue so to exist until good and evil shall be placed in separate worlds appropriated to each. Such is the account of Ibn Shahna. Now if we take the statement of Plutarch, we shall be forced to admit that the ancient doctrine of the Persians was little altered, and in fact only revived by the celebrated impostor Manes, or Mani, whose opinions have been discussed by various modern writers, and have peculiarly exercised the dialectical talents of Bayle. If we prefer the testimony of the Arabian author, we shall still find little reason to be satisfied with the Persian doctrine, which amounts to this, that God is indeed the Creator of the world, but that he was compelled by necessity to create evil with good. What is to be said for a system of theism, which teaches that God was forced to create a Devil?

The Chaldeans seem to have denominated the Supreme Deity אב אור, *Ab aur, the father of fire,* or rather *of light;* but the Greeks, mistaking the meaning of these words, interpreted

them πατρικὸν πῦρ, *paternal fire*. From God was supposed to proceed the supramundane light, ὑπερκόσμιον φῶς, which illumines the empyreum. This light, or fire, was considered as the symbol of the divine essence extending itself to inferior spiritual natures. Hence we find the following expressions in the Chaldean oracles—Ἑαυτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἥρπασεν, οὐδ' ἐν ἐῇ δυνάμει νοερᾷ κλείσας ἴδιον πῦρ—*seipsum rapuit pater, neque in sua potentia intellectuali clausit ignem proprium*—εἰσὶ πάντα πυρὸς ἑνὸς ἐκγεγαῶτα—*sunt omnia ab uno igne progenita*. Now although it may be true that this language is metaphorical, it yet leaves some doubt in the mind, that the Tsabaists did not recognise the Deity as purely immaterial. But there is still another formidable objection to be made to their doctrine. We find the following words in Diodorus Siculus (L. 2.): Οἱ δ' οὖν Χαλδαῖοι τὴν μὲν τοῦ κόσμου φύσιν ἀΐδιόν φασιν εἶναι, καὶ μήτε ἐξ ἀρχῆς γένεσιν ἐσχηκέναι, μήθ' ὕστερον φθορὰν ἐπιδέξεσθαι—*The Chaldeans say that the nature of the world is eternal; and that from the beginning it had no origin, nor has it subsequently exhibited decay.* Now the eternal

existence of the material world can never be admitted into a system of sound theology. It is very possible, however, that Diodorus may have mistaken the meaning of the Chaldean priests. Their opinions, I think, are to be combated on other and more certain grounds, which I shall proceed to point out.

2. Proclus, Damascius, Psellus, and Pletho may be considered as the hierophants of the Chaldaic mysteries. These writers, however, in explaining the metaphysical doctrines of the Orientalists, have expressed themselves in language so obscure, that it is often difficult to comprehend their meaning. We are told that the disciples of Zoroaster, that is to say, the teachers of Tsabaism in Persia and in Chaldea —the Magi and the Chasedim—divided eternal beings into three orders. The first order was again subdivided into three orders; *unus intelligibilium rerum, alter intelligibilium et intellectualium, tertius intellectualium.* The second order was likewise partitioned into three classes. After having spoken of the three first orders Psellus says, *post hosce est alius ordo intelligibilium ac in-*

tellectualium. Hic dividitur tripliciter, in Jynges, Synoches, et Teletarches. Psellus thus speaks of the third order—*Post medium ordinem est intellectualis, habens unam triadem paternam, constantem semel ulteriore, Hecate, bis ulteriore; alteram vero triadem constantem tribus Amelictis, ad quos accedit Hypezocos. Hi sunt septem fontes.* Then follow the *Hyperarchii*, the unzoned Gods, the zoned Gods, Angels, Dæmons, and Minds. The reader, who wishes to know more on this subject, may consult the treatise of Stanley, which follows his lives of the philosophers.

The authors of the Jewish *cabala* probably borrowed many of their notions from the Chaldeans. Thus the classes into which they partitioned the celestial hierarchy had probably their origin in the metaphysical dreams of the Babylonians. According to the Cabalists, nine different orders of spirits peopled the supernal world —Seraphin, Cherubin, Thrones, Dominations, Virtues, Powers, Principalities, Archangels, Angels. The gradations and attributes of these spirits were thus expressed in the Sephiroth—the Crown, Wisdom, Intelligence, Magnificence,

Fortitude, Beauty, Victory, Glory, the Kingdom.

But without entering into further details concerning these imaginary distinctions, we may observe, that the Tsabeans held that all inferior spiritual beings were emanations from the Supreme Deity. Proclus has expressed this notion, though with his usual obscurity of language, in the following words—*μία καὶ συνεχής ἐστιν ἡ τῶν θεῶν πρόοδος, ἀνωθεν ἀπὸ τῶν νοητῶν καὶ κρυφίων ἑνάδων εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον μερισμὸν τελευτήσασα τῆς θείας αἰτίας—the progression of the Gods is one and continuous, proceeding supernally from the intelligible and latent unities, and terminating in the last partition of the divine cause.* (L. 6. c. 2.)

Now the doctrine of emanation has this defect, that it supposes inferior spiritual beings to owe their existence rather to a paramount necessity, than to the will of the Deity. The effluence must exist with the essence; and hence the emanation must be co-eternal with the source from which it flows. Thus, as we have seen above, the Chaldeans held the three orders of intellectual beings to be eternal. Nor

is this the sole objection to their system. The emanation is of the same nature as the substance from which it proceeds. The effluence is of the essence. Thus would it follow, not only that angels, but that dæmons are emanations from the Deity.

3. It is difficult, if not impossible, to speak clearly of the Divine Being. He who tries to express the attributes of God by the help of abstractions, confines himself to negatives, and easily loses sight of his ideas, in wandering through a wilderness of words. He who heaps superlatives on superlatives, *best*, *wisest*, *greatest*, only exaggerates qualities which are found in man. That there exists an only God, and that that God is a perfect and beneficent Being, both reason and religion sufficiently teach; but of the Divine nature, of the substance of the Deity, or of the manner of his existence, the human mind is inadequate to form any just conception. We can affix no clear ideas to omnipotence, omniscience, infinity, eternity.

Under these circumstances we ought not too severely to blame the Tsabaists, if they repre-

sented immaterial natures by material types. Had the rest of the doctrine been sound, we could scarcely have objected to Zoroaster, that he clothed Oromasdes with light, and Arimanius with darkness. We find examples even among ourselves, where metaphorical language hardly keeps within the bounds of sane theology. There is more poetry than philosophy in the following beautiful lines of Milton:

> Hail, holy light, offspring of Heaven first-born,
> Or of th' eternal, co-eternal beam!
> May I express thee unblamed, *since God is light,*
> And never but in unapproached light
> Dwelt from eternity; dwelt then in thee,
> *Bright effluence of bright essence increate!*

As the sun is the fountain of light, this luminary was considered by the Tsabaists as the symbol of the Deity, who is the fountain of intelligence. They imagined inferior spirits to be divided into certain classes; and these were represented by the stars, according to their magnitudes. A pre-established harmony was supposed to exist between the spiritual world and the material; and the latter was

held to be a type, and a developement obvious to sense, of the former. The undeviating order observed in the march of the celestial bodies; their regular revolutions in their orbits; and the concert which exists, or seems to exist among them; were believed to typify the relations established by Infinite Wisdom among the spiritual hierarchs of heaven. While indeed those countless and brilliant orbs pursue in apparent accord their various paths; while they attract, repel, and avoid each other; and while they course the etherial plains without ever jarring; they may perhaps be not inaptly said to represent figuratively the intellectual Powers, Spirits, or Angels, that in uniform agreement obey, in their different spheres, the mandates of the Supreme Ruler of the universe.

This doctrine, however, led the Tsabaists to make some very strange conclusions. Not satisfied with saying in a metaphorical sense, that harmony existed among the celestial bodies, they insisted that a real musical concert was produced by the motions of the

stars. This singular notion appears to have been introduced at a very early period into Greece. It is well known that, according to the mythology attributed to Orpheus, the Muses were considered as *the souls of the spheres.* This notion seems indeed to have been very generally adopted by the Greek mythologists. *Qui Musas tres tantum esse arbitrati sunt, crediderunt illas esse artes, per quas perveniretur ad sapientiæ cognitionem. Communior tamen fuit opinio quod Musæ essent sphærarum animæ.* (*Nat. Comes,* L. 7.) Thus the Muses were supposed to animate the celestial spheres; and Apollo, or the Sun, was said to be the conductor of the concert which they produced. Pythagoras appears to have obtained his notions on this subject from the Chaldeans and the Egyptians; but it may be suspected that either he, or his disciples, had not clearly comprehended the doctrine of the Orientalists. I refer the reader to Stanley, who has copied his account of the Pythagorean musical system from Nicomachus. I cannot, however, refrain from quoting some sentences from Macrobius, which neither Stanley nor

Brucker have adduced: *Plato in Republica sua, cum de sphærarum cœlestium volubilitate tractaret, singulas ait Sirenas singulis orbibus insidere; significans sphærarum motu cantum numinibus exhiberi. Nam Siren Deo canens Græco intellectu valet. Theologi quoque novem Musas octo sphærarum musicos cantus, et unam maximam continentiam, quæ constat ex omnibus, esse voluere. Unde Hesiodus in Theogonia sua octavam Musam et Uraniam vocat; quia post septem vagas, quæ subjectæ sunt, octava stellifera sphæra superposita proprio nomine cœlum vocatur.—Apollinem ideò* μουσηγέτην *vocant; quasi ducem et principem orbem cæterorum.—In ipsis quoque hymnis Deorum per stropham et antistropham metra canoris versibus adhibebantur: ut per stropham rectus orbis stelliferi motus, per antistropham diversus vagarum regressus, prædicaretur.*

I observe the following passage in Plutarch's dialogue on music: Ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ὑμῖν, ὦ ἑταῖροι, καὶ μάλιστα σεμνοτάτην ἀποφαῖνον μουσικὴν παραλέλειπται· τὴν γὰρ τῶν ὄντων φορὰν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀστέρων κίνησιν οἱ περὶ Πυθαγόραν καὶ Ἀρχύταν καὶ Πλάτωνα, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν

ἀρχαίων φιλοσόφων, οὐκ ἄνευ μουσικῆς γίνεσθαι καὶ συνεστάναι ἔφασκον.—*But, my friends,* (says one of the interlocutors,) *you have omitted to take notice of that which chiefly renders music most distinguished and remarkable; for the followers of Pythagoras, Archytas, and Plato, and the rest of the ancient philosophers, say that the impulse of substances, and the motion of the stars, take place and are constituted not without music.* The stars were supposed to move in a sort of dance, or measure, in accord with the music which they produced. Lucian attributes the origin of the dance to that ancient and divine Eros, which was the demiourgos of the Greek mythologists; and then he adds—ἡ γοῦν χορεία τῶν ἀστέρων, καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς ἀπλανεῖς τῶν πλανήτων συμπλοκὴ, καὶ εὔρυθμος αὐτῶν κοινωνία, καὶ εὔτακτος ἁρμονία, τῆς πρωτογόνου ὀρχήσεως δείγματά ἐστι—*Therefore the dance, or choral march, of the stars, and the complicated movement of the planets among the fixed stars, their common concord, and harmonious order, offer exemplars of the primitive dance.* In the recitation of Greek tragedies, the chorus moved in cadence, first in one direction, while

singing the strophe, and then in another, while singing the antistrophe. This dance was said to have been intended to imitate the motions of the celestial bodies ; and was probably derived from the rites instituted by the Tsabaists in the East. It appears to have been the custom in Syria and Arabia for heliolaters to salute the Sun by kissing their hands in honour of that luminary. This practice prevailed in the time of Job (xxxi.) ; and was probably not discontinued until the introduction of Islamism. Now let us hear Lucian, who was born on the banks of the Euphrates: *The Indians*, says he, *after they have risen in the morning, adore the Sun, not as we do, who think our worship complete, when we have kissed our hands; but they, standing with their faces turned towards the East,* ὀρχήσει τὸν ἥλιον ἀσπάζονται, σχηματίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς σιωπῇ, καὶ μιμούμενοι τὴν χορείαν τοῦ θεοῦ—*salute the Sun with a dance, arranging themselves in silence, and imitating the dance, or measured march of the God.* The mythologists of Greece feigned that the stars danced and sang in eternal chorus round Olympus, and that the Sun was the leader of

the celestial symphony. A Greek poet thus addresses Apollo—

Σοὶ μὲν χορὸς εὔδιος ἀστέρων
Κατ' Ὄλυμπον ἄνακτα χορεύει,
Ἄνετον μέλος αἰὲν ἀείδων,
Φοιβηΐδι τερπόμενος λύρᾳ.

For thee a serene chorus of stars dances on regal Olympus, ever chanting a sacred song, delighted, to the Phœbean lyre.

From this sketch of the doctrines of the Tsabeans, considered independently of the worship of images, the reader will be enabled to form at least a general notion of perhaps the most perfect, and certainly the most widely extended, religious system, which was ever invented by the unassisted reason of man. Why the introduction of image-worship should have been so easily admitted by some of the nations which professed Tsabaism, while it was so sternly rejected by others, is a question of no easy solution. There can be no doubt, however, that a complete schism was thus effected between

the Persians and their neighbours—between those whom Sharestani designates as *cultores stellarum*, and those whom he designates as *cultores imaginum*. Yet where the use of symbols had once existed—where men had already agreed to consider the Sun as the type of the Deity, and the stars as the types of the celestial hierarchs,—there seems to be no great deviation from principle, in admitting types of these types, and in referring both to their prototypes. If the Sun were to be revered as the image of God, why might not an idol be venerated as the image of the Sun?

The worship of symbols of the celestial bodies, (themselves adored as visible symbols of invisible powers,) probably soon followed the establishment of Tsabaism among the Egyptians, Syrians, Chaldeans, and Indians. He, who offered up his daily orisons to the Sun under the shade of a particular tree, soon came to consider that tree itself with religious respect. He, who chose a peculiar rock, or stone, as the altar on which he sacrificed to his Gods, easily considered it as hallowed by the frequent per-

formance of a sacred rite. When therefore the Tsabaist changed his residence, he naturally carried off with him a part of the tree, or a part of the stone, which had been consecrated by religious ceremonies, and which had been dedicated to religious purposes. The relic was regarded with awe and veneration. It was a monument that recalled the name and the worship of some superior and invisible being, that had been adored under the shade of the grove, or under the covert of the rock. The barbarian feared it as a God; the idolater bowed down before it as a symbol of deity.

We accordingly find the most ancient idols to have been unshapen stumps and stones. Juno was represented by a square plank of wood (σανὶς) in the isle of Samos; and the image, if it could be so called, of Minerva, placed by Danaus in Lindus, was of a form equally rude. (Euseb. Pr. Ev. L. 3. c. 8.) A wooden Hermes in the temple of Minerva Polias at Athens, said to have been the gift of Cecrops, was probably fabricated with as little art as the shapeless trunk which represented the

goddess herself. (Euseb. in loc. cit. Pausan. Attic. c. 27.) Neither does the image of Hercules, which was made of wood, and which was believed to have been the work of Dædalus, and the gift of that artist to the people of Corinth, appear to have been fabricated with much greater skill than the shapeless idols already described. (Pausan. Corinth. c. 4.) It were needless to speak of the first effigies of the god of gardens. They had at least the merit of being less indecent than later and more finished representations of the deity of Lampsacus. According to Pliny, stumps of vines served as the first idols of Diana. The ancient Gauls are said by Lucan to have represented their Gods by inform idols cut from the trunks of trees;

———simulacraque mœsta Deorum
Arte carent, cæsisque extant informia truncis.

The objects of worship among the Germans seem not to have been in better condition. Their idols are described by Tacitus as *statuæ è stipitibus rudibus. Quand un arbre consacré mouroit*, says Pellontier, in his history of the Celts, *il ne perdoit pas pour cela le privilège d'être*

le symbole de la Divinité. On en ôtoit l'écorce, on le tailloit en pyramide ou en colonne, afin qu'il durât plus long-tems ; et on lui rendoit, sous cette nouvelle forme, les mêmes honneurs qu'auparavant.

Stones, rudely cut into the forms of globes, columns, cones, and pyramids, were likewise objects of adoration among the Pagans of remote antiquity. The *bætylia*, or *bætyloi*, which are called animated stones by Sanchoniatho, are said by that ancient author to have been fabricated by Ouranos. These stones were very numerous on Mount Lebanon, where, according to Damascius, many miraculous things were attributed to them; and where they were consecrated to different deities. If we believe Priscian, the *baitylos* was also called *abdir*, or *abadir;* but, as Bochart remarks, this is probably a corruption for *aben-dir*, a round stone.

It is expressly asserted by Pausanias, that the Greeks anciently adored white (or unsculptured) stones for images of the Gods—τὰ δὲ ἔτι παλαιότερα καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἕλλησι τιμὰς θεῶν ἀντὶ ἀγαλμάτων εἶχον ἀργοὶ λίθοι. (Achaic. c. 22.) Many of the stones sacred to Hermes continued

down to later times to bear the rude forms which they had received from the first worshippers of that deity. A stone in the shape of a small pyramid served at Megara to represent Apollo. (Pausan. Attic. c. 44.) Ovid seems to doubt, whether the God Terminus, who disputed the possession of the Capitol with Jupiter, were the stump of a tree, or a stone—

Termine, sive lapis, sive es defossus in agro
Stipes!

But Virgil decides that Terminus was a stone—

———*Capitoli immobile saxum.*

Stones of various shapes and colours were long adored in Asia as emblems of the Sun, and Moon, and Planets. Every one has heard of the black stone of Emesa, rendered famous by the fanatical devotion of Heliogabalus. I shall have occasion presently to speak of another black stone, which for many ages was worshipped by the Arabians, and which even since the Mahometan æra has continued to be

regarded by them with superstitious reverence.

When men began to cultivate the arts and sciences, they soon learned to give more appropriate forms to the images of their deities. The Greeks succeeded in adorning their statues with that ideal beauty, which modern artists have admired but have not rivalled. The Egyptians, on the contrary, appear to have considered the images of their Gods as mere symbols; and guided by their hieroglyphs, endeavoured to express the attributes of each deity by conventional signs, sculptured with little regard to beauty or elegance, in the formation of some monstrous idol. We may account in the same manner for the fantastic shapes given to the images of the Indian Gods. The object was still to represent the character and attributes of each of these Gods by the symbolical form given to the image.

The Arabians, during the early period of their history, appear, like other barbarous nations, to have been satisfied with taking unsculptured stones for representatives of their deities. I shall soon have occasion to take

notice of some of these rude images of the Gods of the Arabian Pantheon. In process of time, however, idols, copied from those of the Syrians and Chaldeans, were introduced into the peninsula. No less than three hundred and sixty images, according to Al Jannabi, (Pococke, p. 100.) were placed round the temple of Mekkah. Amru ben Lohai has been accused of importing the idolatry of the Syrians into Arabia; but there can be little doubt that the Arabians had adopted the superstitions of their neighbours at a much earlier period.

I shall now proceed to give a list of the Arabian deities and idols, of which I have been able to collect the names; and I shall arrange these names in alphabetical order, both for the reader's convenience and my own.

---

1. العوق *Al-auph.* Mention is made of this idol by Pococke, who, however, gives us no information concerning it. In Hebrew עוף *auph*, and in Syriac ܥܘܦܐ *aupha*, signified a bird of prey. I am inclined to think that the idol in

question was originally Syrian. Perhaps it may have been the *nasr* or eagle, which we shall afterwards find enumerated among the objects of Arabian worship, and which, being of course represented under the form of a bird, may have been called κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *al auph*, the bird.

2. الدبران *Aldebaran*. Misam, says Abulfaraj, worshipped Aldebaran.

By Aldebaran the Arabians generally designate the fourth lunar mansion, and those stars in the constellation of Taurus called Hyades by the Greeks; but they more particularly give this appellation to the brilliant star, which they likewise name *ain al thor*, the Bull's eye. This star is reckoned by the Orientalists as belonging to the cluster of the Hyades. I know not why Didymus Alexandrinus has said, Ὑάδες οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων ταύρου ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες—*Hyades, the seven stars on the Bull's horns*, since they are clearly *under*, and not *on* the horns of the Bull. An Arabian author, cited by Pococke, says—*Al Debaran est stella rutilans, lucida, et cum ea quatuor aliæ, quas ubi ei adjunxeris, figura referent*

literam د. Here the name of Aldebaran is given to the Bull's eye, independently of the other stars of the cluster. It was therefore probably this ruddy and lucid star, the representative of some celestial hierarch, that was the object of Misam's adoration. It seems difficult to explain the meaning of Aldebaran, or to understand why that appellation was given to the star which has received it. Cæsius strangely mistakes the matter when he says, *maxima in austrino Tauri oculo dicitur Arabice Aldebaran, quod plane idem denotat ac* λαμπαδίας, *id est succularum lucida.* Hyde's interpretation is probably nearer the truth—*whatever arrives afterwards—that which follows.* Perhaps the Hyades, and their brilliant, received the name of Aldebaran as rising after the Pleiades, called *Althoraia;* and likewise النجم *Alnegim,* apparently from the splendour of the asterism. We learn from Alphergani, that Aldebaran is also known to the Arabians by the name of الفنيق *Alphanik, the male camel;* while the surrounding stars of the cluster receive the appellation of القلايص *Alkalais, the female camels.* Pococke (p. 134.) has committed

an obvious error in writing *Al Fatik*, for *Al Phanik*.

3. الضيزن *Al Dsaizan.* Pococke writes this name in Roman characters *Al Daizan*; he then adds, *quod etiam idoli nomen, idem forsan erat cum Saturno: conjecturæ ansam præbet quod apud Ebn Chalecanum legitur, in vita Al Battanii; regem scilicet quendam* ساطرون *Satrun appellatum, quod (inquit) vocabulum est Syriacum, et significat* الملك *regem, nomen autem* ضيزن *Daizan, quod est* اسم صنم كان في الجاهلية وسمي الرجل, *i. e. nomen idoli antiqui, quo appellabatur vir iste. Quidni autem et* ساطرون *Satrun idoli nomen sit? Saturni scilicet: at Syriacum est, et regem denotat. Syris certe* ܣܛܪܐ *Setoro est adjutorium, protectio, patrocinium, quod regium est, necnon absconditum, latibulum, &c. a* ܣܛܪ *quod et protegere est, et abscondere, ab Hebraico* סתר *latuit, abscondit se. Saturni autem latentis indicium est Latii nomen, et* ܣܛܘܪܢܐ *Satrono forma est Syris non inusitata. Dicitur autem Saturnus Syris alias* ܩܝܘܢ *Cevan, ut et Arabibus* كيوان *Caiwan.* If such a name as *Satrun* in Syriac were given to an idol called *Al Dsaizan* in Arabic, it is clear that Pococke has mistaken

the root. *Dsaizan*, or *Daizan*, is to be referred to the Arabic ضاز or ضيز; and signifies *an unjust person, he who injures another*. It is evident, therefore, that if he, who was named *Dsaizan* in Arabic, received the appellation of *Satrun* in Syriac as a synonym, we ought to look for the root of *Satrun*, not under ;ܣܛܪ (*Hebraice* סתר) *latuit, abscondit se*, but under ;ܣܛܪ (סטר) which in Chaldaic, and no doubt in Syriac, signified *to destroy, to demolish, to injure*. But the Arabian writer says, that *Satrun* signifies *king* in Syriac. It is strange that Pococke should still labour to show that *Satrun* might bear this sense as derived from סתר, *latuit*. *Satrun*, understood as signifying a king, is to be referred to the Chaldaic root שטר; though the Chaldeans seem to have generally understood this word to signify præfect, or chief, or ruler, rather than king.

The question under examination may lead to some curious results. It would appear from the statement of the Arabian author, that an ancient idol existed in Syria, of which the name was *Satrun*, and that this name was understood to signify ملك *melek*, or king. Now it

must follow, that the *Satrun* of the Syrians was the same with the *El* of the Phœnicians, whose name the Greeks rendered by *Kronos*, and the Latins by *Saturnus*. But the Latins must have taken their *Saturnus* directly from the Syriac *Satrun;* and understanding this last name to be derived from סתר *latuit*, they made some ingenious conclusions, which I shall recal to the memory of the reader. Saturn, as the poets and mythologists tell us, having escaped from Tartarus, where, according to Æschylus, (*in Prometheo,*) he had been confined by Jupiter, sought refuge in Italy. Hence Ovid says—

Inde diu genti mansit Saturnia nomen:
Dicta fuit Latium terra, latente Deo.

Virgil represents Saturn as escaping from Olympus, where Jupiter remained victorious, and as civilizing the rude inhabitants of the country where he settled.

Primus ab ethereo venit Saturnus Olympo,
Arma Jovis fugiens, et regnis exul ademtis.
Is genus indocile ac dispersum montibus altis
Composuit, legesque dedit. Latiumque vocari
Maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris.

.En. L. 8.

Servius observes—*Virgilius Latium vult dici, quod illic Saturnus latuit.* Nothing can be clearer then, than that the Latins derived the name of Saturnus from סתר *latuit.* But they must also have had some notion, whether distinct or not, that *Saturnus* might be connected with another Oriental word, not very dissimilar in sound, namely, שטר, generally explained by the Chaldeans as signifying a ruler, but which other nations seem to have understood as equivalent to king. Certain it is that the deity called Melech or Moloch (i. e. *Rex*) by the Orientalists, was always named *Kronos* by the Greeks, and *Saturnus* by the Latins. If the reader will compare the description given by R. D. Kimchi, (in his commentary on the 23d chapter of the 2d book of Kings,) of the idol of Moloch, with what is said by Diodorus Siculus (L. 20.) of the brazen image of Saturn at Carthage, he will not doubt for a moment of the identity of Moloch and Saturn.

4. اللات *Allat* is mentioned in the Koran as the idol of a female deity. It will be remembered that Herodotus says, in his first book, that

the Arabians call Venus Alitta, and in his third book that they call Urania Alilat. Whether the Greek historian meant the same goddess by Alitta and Alilat, and whether he had forgotten, when he came to his third book, how he had written the name in his first, I shall leave others to determine. I cannot help thinking, however, that the Alitta of Herodotus was the same with the Allat of the Koran.

Pococke has enumerated various etymologies of the name of Allat, which have been proposed by different Arabian authors. But not one of these can be reconciled with the orthography of the name as it is found in the Koran. Pococke himself writes the name Allatt, apparently in conformity with the etymology which best coincides with the orthography; but M. de Sacy observes, that in the Koran the final letter of the name is not found with the *teshdid*. Besides, those who derive the name from لت *latta*, or *latt*, (which signifies to mix,) can affix no sense to it, which is likely to satisfy any but themselves.

Assemani strenuously contends that اللات *Allat* is to be deduced from الله *Allah, Deus;*

or rather that it is this word under the feminine form, and signifies *Dea*. But here again the orthography is opposed to the conclusion of the learned author. I know not how this objection is to be removed, unless we suppose with Al Jauhari, quoted by Pococke, that, in writing this name, the letter ه *h* had been changed by some of the Arabians into the letter ت *t*.

5. العزي *Al Ozi* or *Al Ozza*. This idol, of which mention is likewise made in the Koran, represented a female deity, worshipped by the tribe of the Koreish, and by the descendants of Cananah. Some pretend that the idol was made from a tree, called *al samorat*, the Egyptian thorn, which was consecrated by a person of the name of *Tsalem*, who built a house over it that was called *Bos* or *Boss*, and in which some extraordinary sound was heard by those who entered it. Several writers seem to think that *Al Ozza* was so named from العزيز *Al aziz*, *the mighty*, one of the divine appellations; and that the goddess was a personification of the power of the deity.

6. الشارق *Al Sharak*. Pococke makes men-

tion of a man surnamed *Abd al Sharak*, worshipper of the rising sun. The custom of adoring this luminary, when every morning it appears in the east, was probably common to all the nations which professed Tsabaism.

7. عوض *Auds*, or *Aud*, was an idol worshipped by the tribe of *Bekr Wayel*. Pococke quotes the following lines from an Arabian poet—

حلفت *بمايرات حول عوض

وانصاب تركن لدي سعير *

Juravi per sanguinem fluentem circa Audum

Et per statuas quæ relictæ sunt apud al Sairum.

It appears that victims were sacrificed on idols, or rather on unsculptured stones, placed round the Kaaba.

8. اوال *Awal*—an idol worshipped by the tribe of the Wailites. (*Golius in voce.*)

9. بغ *Bag*. Some consider this idol to have been originally Persian; and pretend, that the name of the city of Bagdad signifies *the gift of Bag*. I find the following words in Hesychius —*Βαγαῖος, ὁ μάταιος, ἢ Ζεὺς Φρύγιος, μέγας, πολὺς, ταχύς.*

* I should propose to read بمايراة.

10. باجر *Bajar—idolum ab Azdensibus cultum.* The name of this idol, derived from بجر, implies that it was considered as of evil influence.

11. *Kabar.* *The Saracens*, says Euthymius, *continued to be idolaters until the time of the emperor Heraclius, adoring the star Lucifer, and Venus, which last they call Chabar* (Χαβὰρ) *in their language, and which signifies Great.* The words of Cedrenus, in which he puts an Arabian prayer into Greek characters—Ἀλλᾶ, Ἀλλᾶ, οὐὰ, Κουβὰρ, κ.τ.λ. have been so often commented upon, from the days of Selden to the present time, that I shall refrain from making any remarks on them. The goddess, known by the epithet of *Kabar, Great,* was apparently the same with Zuhret and Beltha.

12. دوار *Duar*, or دار *Dar*, has been called an idol; but I rather suspect that the name was given to the whole circle of idols that surrounded the Kaaba. (*Golius in voce.*)

13. ذو الخلصة *Dsu al Chalasat.* This appears to have been the name of an idol, placed in a temple belonging to the tribe of Chathaam, which was called the *Kaabat of Yemen*, and

which also received the appellation of بيت اصنام, rendered by Pococke, *the house of idols.*

14. ذو الشرا *Dsu al shara*, or *Dhu 'l shara*; otherwise written ذو شرا *Dsu*, or *Dhu shara*. This name has given rise to much speculation. Stephanus Byzantinus has said—*Δουσάρη σκόπελος καὶ κορυφὴ ὑψηλοτάτη Ἀραβίας, εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Δουσάρου, θεὸς δὲ οὗτος παρὰ Ἄραψι καὶ Δαχαρηνοῖς τιμώμενος*—*Dusare is a rock and very lofty summit of Arabia, so called from Dusaros, who is honoured as a God by the Arabians and Dachareni.* Hesychius, on the authority of Isidorus, states, that the Nabataei held Dusare to be Dionysus—*Δουσάρην, τὸν Διόνυσον, Ναβαταῖοι, ὥς φησιν Ἰσίδωρος.*

It seems now to be generally agreed, that ذو *dsu*, vulgarly pronounced *dhu* or *du*, signifies *Lord.* It is the opinion of Assemani, that the name before us is composed of ذو *dhu*, and سراة *sorat*; and that *Dhu-al-sorat* signifies Lord of the temple or tower. Pococke gives different interpretations of the name, not one of which appears to me to be more satisfactory than that proposed by Assemani. Some seem to think

that it is composed of ذو and شرا, and that *Dhu-sharah* would mean, splendid Lord. The sense would be good; but I cannot elicit it from the two words before us. Hottinger says, *Dusares, sine dubio, est ipsum Arabum* دوسر (*Dusar*), *quod tamen, significatione sua propria, Priapum verius notat, quam Bacchum.* I am not of Hottinger's opinion. I rather think that there was a place, or district, in the country of the Nabatæi, called *Sari* or *Shari*, of which the deity adored there was called Lord; and that the Greeks either found, or fancied, some resemblance between this deity and Dionysus.

The ancient Greeks, as appears from the hymn of Orpheus to Dionysus, considered this God as the son of Jupiter and Semele. Some modern writers have thought that the name of Dionysus was originally *Διὸς υἱὸς*, altered to *Διόνυσος*, *causa euphoniæ.* We might indeed almost believe that Euripides held the same opinion, when he makes the God say—

"Ηκω Διὸς παῖς τήνδε Θηβαίων χθόνα
Διόννσος, ὃν τίκτει πόθ' ἡ Κάδμου κόρη,
Σεμέλη, λοχευθεῖσ' ἀστραπηφόρῳ πυρί.

Orpheus, or rather the writer who usurps his name, is however very inconsistent with respect to the parentage of Dionysus. In one of his hymns, as I have mentioned above, he calls this deity the son of Jupiter and Semele. In another place he addresses the same god as sprung from Jupiter and Proserpine. Finally, he represents him as the son of Isis, and as surrounded by the nymphs who educated him beside the waters of the Nile. Diodorus Siculus, in his first and fourth books, contends, not only that Dionysus was not originally a Grecian deity, but that he was educated by the nymphs in the cave of Nysa, between Egypt and Phœnice. This cave was in the wooded mountain of Nysa in Arabia Petræa, as appears from the statement of Diodorus, as well as from the words of Nonnus—

> Ἀῤῥαβίην ἐπέβαινε, καὶ εὐόδμων ἀπὸ δένδρων
> Νυσιάδος τανύφυλλον ἐθάμβεε, κ.τ.λ.—(L. 20.)

The Sicilian historian says, that Dionysus received his name ἀπὸ Διὸς καὶ Νύσης. Pococke observes on this—*vox* (*nempe Dionysus*) *erit hy-*

brida, si Diodori sententiam amplectamur, ex Διὸς et Nysa Arabiæ sive Ægypti Arabiæ vicinæ urbe, apud quam Bacchus a Nymphis educatus, conflata. At cur non et hæc pure Arabica, ut Dominum Nysæ sonet? It appears that the words *nuas* and *sarah* both signify a grape in Arabic. Thus Dionusos and Dusares would seem to be corruptions from that language; and both might be understood to signify Lord of grapes. I think it much more likely that the Arabian deity was called *Dhu Nusa*, Lord of Nysa, and *Dhu Shari*, Lord of Shari,—Nysa and Shari being both names of places in Arabia, where there might have been temples of the God called Dionysus by the Greeks.

It would be curious if we found several other names of Dionysus of Arabic origin. Pococke suggests, that the denomination of Bacchus was taken from the Arabic. The laudatory exclamation بخ بخ *bach, bach,* (literally, *great, great,*) might, perhaps, like *evoë, evoë,* be often repeated by those who celebrated the rites of the God of Nysa; and the strangers, who heard this frequent exclamation, might have believed it to be

the appellation of the deity invoked by his votaries.

Hesychius says, that Sabazios is Phrygian. According to Proclus (in Tim. L. 4.) the Phrygians chanted hymns in the month Sabazios, when they celebrated the mysteries of the god who bore the same name. But I suspect that Sabazios is nothing else than a Greek corruption of the word *tsaba*. Dionysus led his victorious armies from Arabia to India. Who has now so little knowledge of mythology as to require to be told, that Dionysus was a solar personification? Dionysus was then really a type of the Sun, the conductor of the *tsabaoth*, the hosts of heaven. The name of the leader came to be confounded with that of those whom he commanded. He was called *tsaba*, or *tsabi*. Pliny says (L. 12. c. 14), that the Arabians called one of their gods *Sabis*; and it would be easy to show that this god was the Sun. The Phrygians may have named the same deity *Saba*; and perhaps the Indian *Seva* was originally the same with the Arabian god. I agree therefore with Vossius, when he says, that Sabazios is

derived from *tsaba—Est vero, inquit,* Σαβάζιος *a* צבא. I shall therefore adopt and only slightly alter the following sentence from the same author, who has not mentioned the Arabians—*Hoc Sabazii numen didicere Græci a Thracibus, Thraces ab Orpheo, Orpheus ab Ægyptiis, vel Syris, vel Arabibus.*

The accounts given of the origin and meaning of the word Bassareus by the Greek lexicographers are altogether puerile. Bochart refers the name to the Hebrew בצר *batsar*, to make the vintage. There was probably an old Arabic word, now lost, which bore the same sense. But I rather suppose that the Greeks gave the appellation of Bassareus to the deity adored in the city of Botsra, or Basra, whom they considered to be the same with Dionysus.

The limits, to which I confine myself, compel me to suppress much that I could say on this subject.

15. هبل *Habel.* This idol is said to have been brought to Mekkah out of Syria by Amru ben Lohai. In this case the name ought to bear its Syriac signification of *debility*, or *vanity*. But

it is little probable, that the son of Lohai would have transported an image bearing such a name from Syria to Mekkah; and have there given it the principal place; for we are told that Habel occupied the most distinguished situation among the idols of the Kaaba. Abulfeda indeed says, that the statue of Habel was placed on the summit of the temple of Mekkah. One arm of this statue, according to Safio'ddini, had been broken off; but he adds, that the tribe of the Koreish replaced the limb which was wanting by one of gold. It was a red stone, says the same author, in the form of a man, holding seven arrows, unbarbed and unfeathered, in his hands.

It may be proper to remark, that the frequent oath of the Arabians بدم هبيل is made in reference to the slaughtered brother of Kain, and without any recollection of the idol Habel.

Assemani thinks that the name of Habel is Arabic, and signifies great, or noble.

16. جهار *Jahar, vel Gehar—idolum quoddam.* Giggæus.—*Hawazenensium idolum.* Pococke.

17. مداں *Madan—nomen idoli.* Golius.

18. مناف *Manaph.*—The name of this idol appears not to be of Arabic origin.

19. مناة *Manath*, was adored by the tribes between Mekkah and Medinah, and is mentioned in the Koran. The commentators have in vain attempted to trace this name to its origin. Some deduce it from مني *meni, fluere;* others from نو *naw, stella;* and others from منان *manan, beneficus.*

For my own part I have little doubt that *Manath* was not originally an Arabic word, and that it was an appellation of the Moon. In ancient Egyptian the word *on, an, en,* as it seems to have been variously sounded in different dialects, and properly signifying *light*, preceded by the letter *m*, the nominal prefix, was pronounced *mon, man, men.* This word appears to have been extended with the Egyptian mythology into many, and into distant regions. It was applied to the luminaries of heaven, and to heaven itself, the objects of their worship by the disciples of the Tsabean doctrines. The first fabulous rulers, in various countries of the

globe, as has been sufficiently proved in the course of this work, were mere personifications of the solar orb. It is then impossible not to remark, that among the first deities, kings, and legislators, of whom tradition makes mention, we hear of the Egyptian Men, or Menes, of the Indian Menu, of the Phrygian Maneus, of the Lydian Mæon, of the Cretan Minos, of the Teutonic Mann. Some of these unquestionably, and probably all of them, were personifications of the Sun. The word, which originally signified light, became in these examples, and in many others, the appellation of the greatest of the celestial luminaries. But it was likewise applied to the lunar orb; and the Greek, Gothic, and Celtic languages bear ample testimony to the truth of this assertion. In the case before us, the Arabians appear to have adopted the word *Manath* as an appellative of the Moon. (See the second volume of this work, p. 398.)

20. النسر *Al Nasr*, the Eagle. This idol must have been very ancient, since it is said to have been worshipped by Himyar. (Pococke,

p. 95.) The notice, which Assemani gives of Al Nasr, is very short, and not very clear;—*Nasr, aquila, sidus cœleste, seu Asteria, de qua ex Sanchoniatone Bochartus.* Sanchoniatho, according to Bochart's reading, says—*that Astarte found* ἀεροπετῆ ἀστερίαν, ὃν καὶ ἀνελομένη ἐν Τύρῳ τῇ ἁγίᾳ νήσῳ, τοῦτον ἀφιέρωσε—*an eagle fallen from the air, which had been killed in Tyre, the sacred island, and consecrated it.* The common reading gives ἀστέρα, *a star*, for ἀστερίαν, *an eagle;* and it has been contended against Bochart, that the sense comes out perfectly well as follows,—*Astarte found a star fallen from the air, and having taken it up in the sacred isle of Tyre, consecrated it.* But I am of opinion that Bochart is right. The eagle was evidently considered as a sacred bird by the Tyrians; and this is evinced by the frequent recurrence of its image on their coins. I do not, however, exactly see what connexion the *Asteria* of Sanchoniatho has with the eagle of the constellations. Perhaps Assemani alluded to the celestial vulture, or eagle, which is represented among the constellations with a lyre, and which is called

by the Arabians النسر الواقع *al nasr al waka, aquila cadens.* But this allusion is surely too remote; and yet I know not how otherwise to explain the meaning of Assemani.

21. *Obodes.* Stephanus Byzantinus says,—*Ὀβόδα, χωρίον Ναβαταίων, ὅπου Ὀβόδης ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὃν θεοποιοῦσι, τέθαπται—Oboda, a country of the Nabatæi, where the king Obodes, whom they deified, is buried.* But عابد *oabad,* which I conclude is the name meant to be designated, signifies a worshipper of God. This king *Obodes* must therefore be admitted into the Arabian Pantheon, not as a God, but as a worshipper of God, or rather of a plurality of gods.

I am not of opinion that the Arabians at any period worshipped mortals after their death as gods; and it has been for this reason that I have not enumerated Asaph and Nayelah among the Arabian deities. The former was the son of Amru, the latter the daughter of Sahal. They were turned into stones, says the tradition, *ob stuprum in Caaba commissum;* but the Koreishites are not the less accused of having afterwards worshipped them as gods.

See, however, another account in Hottinger, p. 232; and yet another in Assemani, vol. 3. part 2. p. 588.

22. *Razecah.—Nom d'une idole des Adites.—Ces idolâtres l'invoquoient pour obtenir les choses nécessaires à l'entretien de la vie.* (D'Herbelot. See also Golius, at the word رزق.)

23. رضا *Redsa.* Pococke says that *Reda*, as he writes the name, was an idol among the posterity of Rabia. I can find no other account of this idol.

24. سعد *Sad.* This *Sad*, or *Saad*, seems to have been the same with the *Baal Gad* of the Syrians, the deity that presided over the fortunes of men.

25. سعير *Sair.* The name of this idol is mentioned under the root سعر in Golius. I have already stated my opinion, that this was the name which the ancient Arabians originally gave to the star Sirius; and that this name came afterwards to be ill-pronounced and ill-written, *Shari* or *Shira*. In fact *al shari* signifies *hirsutus, pilosus*—epithets that do not seem to apply to Sirius. *Al Sair* may be translated

the inflamer, an appellation not inapplicable to the Dog-star.

It is agreed by the commentators, at the words in the Koran, *rab al Shira, Lord of Sirius*, that this star was worshipped by the idolatrous Arabians.

26. *Sakiah*—the name of an idol adored by the Adites, when they wished to obtain rain. (D'Herbelot.)

27. سواع *Sawaa.* This idol is said by the Arabians to have existed before the deluge; and after that event to have been again brought to light by the Devil. Beidavi pretends, that *Sawaa* was represented under the form of a woman.

28. شمس *Shems.* It seems almost superfluous to state, that *al shems*, the Sun, was worshipped by the ancient Arabian idolaters. Stephanus Byzantinus mentions a city near the Red sea, which he calls *Βαίσαμψα*, and adds, *ὅ ἐστιν οἶκος Ἡλίου. Baisampsa* is a manifest corruption for *Bith* or *Baith-Shems*, the house, or temple, of the Sun.

29. ود *Wad.* Beidavi says, that *Wad* was represented under the figure of a man, who lived

between the time of Adam and that of Noach. If we can judge from the meaning of the name of this idol, it ought to have represented the God of love. See Golius, at the word ود.

30. يغوث *Yaguth*, is also mentioned by Beidavi as an antediluvian idol, represented under the form of a lion.

31. يعوق *Yauk*—another antediluvian idol, said by Beidavi to have been represented under the form of a horse.

32. زهرة *Zuhret*—ازهر *Azhur*. *Zuhret* was the name of the planet Venus, and also indicated the goddess otherwise called *Beltha*, or *Balthi*. Thus Ali Said Vaheb Ben Abraham says—يوم الجمعة الزهرة وسمها بلثي—*the sixth day (is consecrated) to Zuhret, whose name is Beltha.*

END OF BOOK VI,

AND OF VOLUME III.

CORRIGENDA

TO VOL. II.

page	line		read
3,	3.	for *may*	read *cannot*
10,	12.	— 16 *cubits*	— 15 *or* 16 *cubits*
—	16.	— *give* 12	— *give* 11 *or* 12
33,	2.	— *Tunis*	— *Tanis*
64,	12.	— ΦΙΟШ	— ΦΙΟU
67,	3.	— *Gaetz*	— *Geetz*
125,	11.	— ШД-N̄ΤΗШ	— UД-N̄ΤΗШ
—	last.	— ЖШІШ	— ЖUІU
—	—	— Ъ Ш І Ш	— Ъ U І U
126,	1.	— ШШІН	— ШUІН
—	—	— ШШОҮН	— ШUОҮН
—	7.	— ЪНШ *and* ЪШОШ	— ЪНU *and* ЪUОU
128,	10.	— ПШЄҘ-ШШОҮН	— ПUЄҘ-ШUОҮН
129,	16.	— ШШОҮН	— ШUОҮН
—	—	— ПШЄҘ-ШШОҮН	— ПUЄҘ-ШUОҮН
322,	8.	— ŪОЖОЄІН	— ŪОҮОЄІН
—	9.	— ДUОЖ	— ДUОҮ
—	10.	— ДUОЖ	— ДUОҮ
324,	13.	— ДСОЖΛІ	— ДСОҮΛІ
—	15.	— ДЖ	— ДҮ
—	18.	— ЄЖО	— ЄҮО
—	last.	— ОЖІШС	— ОҮІШС
325,	18.	— ЖОЖШU	— ЖОҮШU
—	—	— ОЖШU	— ОҮШU
—	19.	— ЖОЖДВ	— ЖОҮДВ
—	—	— ОЖДВ	— ОҮДВ
401,	21.	— ОЖШН	— ОҮШН
—	22.	— ОЖШІНІ	— ОҮШІНІ
504,	21.	— *which had been columns*	— *columns which had been.*

00035252

LONDON:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,

RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 16 January, 2016